

Young,

'44

AM
1944
yo



B O S T O N U N I V E R S I T Y
G R A D U A T E S C H O O L

Thesis

GOD, THE WORLD, AND THE SOUL
IN THE WRITINGS OF PHILO JUDAEUS

by

Warren Cameron Young
(A.B. in Th., Gordon College, 1942)

submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
1944

ak
1944

Am
1944
yo

A P P R O V E D

by

First Reader *Edgar S. Brydeman*
.....
Professor of Philosophy

Second Reader *L. Harold De Wolf*
.....
Professor of Philosophy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER	1
1. The problem	1
2. Life and times of Philo	2
3. Philo's writings	5
4. The allegorical method	6
II. INFLUENCES UPON PHILO	8
1. The Hebrew Scriptures	8
i. View of God	8
ii. The Decalogue	10
iii. Messianic Hope	10
iv. Prophetic writings	11
2. Alexandrian Thought	12
3. Greek Philosophers	16
i. Pythagoreans	17
ii. Heraclitus	17
iii. Empedocles	18
iv. Plato	19
v. Aristotle	19
vi. Stoics	19
vii. Epicureans	20
III. GOD, THE WORLD, AND THE SOUL	21
1. God	21
i. Existence	21
ii. Attributes	22
2. World	25
i. The cosmos	25
ii. Dependence on God	27
iii. Mind of the universe	28
3. Soul	29
i. Pre-existence and immortality	29
ii. Relation to God	30
iii. Spirit	31
iv. Relation to mind	32
v. Reason	35
IV. THE LOGOS	36
1. Logos before Philo	36
2. Philo's view	40
3. Is the Logos a personality?	44

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. THE POWERS	46
1. Number of powers	46
2. Relation to Logos	46
3. Purpose of each	47
4. Relation to each other	48
5. Influence from other sources	48
VI. OTHER PROBLEMS AND HIS SOLUTIONS	49
1. Matter	49
2. Creation	49
i. The Universe	49
ii. Man	52
3. Evil	54
4. Election	55
i. God's choice of Abraham	55
ii. The other patriarchs	56
iii. Concerning world powers	56
VII. INFLUENCE OF PHILO	58
1. New Testament	58
2. Church Fathers	65
3. Neoplatonism	69
4. Gnosticism	72
5. Allegorical Method	76
VIII. CONCLUSION	78
1. Summary	78
2. Conclusions	86
APPENDIX	88
BIBLIOGRAPHY	90



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

1. The problem

Shortly after the founding of the City of Alexandria¹ there arose in that city a type of thought generally called "The Alexandrian School." Actually there were two distinct schools of thought which arose in that city, each having its own distinct purpose. The first of these was founded about 306 B.C. and lasted until about 30 B.C. This school was interested in science and literature. The second began about 30 B.C., although traces of its development may be found as far back as 280 B.C., and lasted almost to the time of the destruction of Alexandria by the Arabs in 642 A.D. The interest of this school was purely philosophical and eclectic in form and development. "The doctrines of this school were a fusion of the Eastern and Western thought, and combined in varying proportions the elements of Hellenistic and Jewish philosophy."² Practically all the work of this school was done by Philo Judaeus, a contemporary of Jesus. Philo took the Greek metaphysical theories, and, by the allegorical method, interpreted them in accordance with the Jewish Revelation."³

-
1. A brief history of Alexandria will be found in section 2 of this chapter.
 2. Anonymous, Art.(1910), 575.
 3. Loc. cit.

The work of Philo then, was an attempt to reconcile the Greek philosophy with the Jewish revelation. It is the problem of this study to examine Philo's position as found in his writings and to compare it with the thought of the Greek philosophers in order to ascertain the extent of his success, and in addition his influence upon subsequent philosophical and religious developments. Philo was a Jew and a professing believer in the Jewish revelation. How then did he modify or change his conception of this revelation in the light of Greek philosophy?

2. The life and times of Philo

The city of Alexandria was founded by Alexander the Great in 332 B.C. The site of the city was near the mouth of the Nile River, a natural gateway to both Egypt and the East. It grew rapidly, soon exceeded Carthage in size and importance, for centuries rivaling Rome in population and commerce. After the fall of Tyre the commerce of the East as well as Egypt passed through its portals.¹

The people of the city were made up of three main races, Greeks, Egyptians, and Jews. Alexandria became the largest Jewish city in the world. Philo says that two-fifths of its population were Jews and that there were over a million

1. Atkinson, Art.(1910), 570.

Jews in Egypt.¹ In Philo's time this segregation of the population into racial groups led to the expression of anti-Semitic outbursts in which thousands of Jews were slain.²

In 80 B.C. the city passed formally under the control of Rome, by the will of Ptolemy Alexander. The city had been under the control of Rome for almost a century so there was little change. At the time of Philo it had been placed directly under the jurisdiction of the emperor and was subject directly to him.³

There is one date which is fairly sure in the life of Philo.⁴ In 40 A.D. he went at the head of a delegation of five to Rome in an effort to persuade the emperor Caius to abstain from asking divine honor from the Jews. At that time Philo was probably fifty years old or even more, which places the date of his birth about 20-10 B.C.⁵

The Helleno-Judaistic movement spread rapidly among the Jews of the diaspora but in Palestine itself it was little felt because of the opposition of the Maccabeans.

-
1. Philo, Fl, IX, 6-8. For a list of Philo's writings with their standard abbreviations, see the appendix. In general the abbreviations used are those suggested by the editors of his works in the Loeb Classical Library. The list is given in the introduction to Volume I of that series. Ex. IA ii, I, 227, means Allegorical Interpretation ii, in Loeb Classical Library, Volume I, page 227.
 2. Philo, Fl, and Ca, IX.
 3. Schurer and Bigg, Art.(1910), 409.
 4. Philo, Ca, IX, 46; Schürer and Bigg, Art.(1910), 409.
 5. Hogarth, Art.(1910), 570.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS
AND ARCHITECTURE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS
AND ARCHITECTURE
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS
AND ARCHITECTURE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS
AND ARCHITECTURE
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS
AND ARCHITECTURE
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS
AND ARCHITECTURE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS
AND ARCHITECTURE
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS
AND ARCHITECTURE
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS
AND ARCHITECTURE

In the diaspora the Jews forgot their Semitic tongue and adopted the Greek language and culture. The two cultures were blended to a great extent with the Greek predominating, but in one respect the Jew remained the same, namely, with respect to his religion. The majority did not forget their Jehovah nor that they were his "chosen people."¹

In 280 B.C. their Scriptures were translated into Greek in the famous Septuagint Version. Many writers hold that the first traces of Hellenism appear in the philosophical words used in this translation. Then in the first century B.C. there appeared The Book of Wisdom in which the Divine Wisdom is treated as a reflection of God's glory, and is generally thought to be in line with the doctrine of the Logos as set forth by Philo, as well as the later development in Plotinus and the Christian theology. But for the Jews, Jehovah was all-sufficient. To them the purpose of philosophy was but to help defend their revelation from all attack. Philo in all his writings professes pure orthodoxy and we have no reason to doubt his sincerity. He believed that Moses was infallible and that the Hebrew scriptures were the divine revelation of Jehovah. "Philosophers and prophets alike were all setting forth in different allegorical forms the same essential ideas."²

-
1. Hogarth, Art.(1910), 570.
 2. Fuller, HAMP, 270.

the first of these is the fact that the
the second is the fact that the
the third is the fact that the

the fourth is the fact that the
the fifth is the fact that the
the sixth is the fact that the

the seventh is the fact that the
the eighth is the fact that the
the ninth is the fact that the

the tenth is the fact that the
the eleventh is the fact that the
the twelfth is the fact that the

the thirteenth is the fact that the
the fourteenth is the fact that the
the fifteenth is the fact that the

3. Philo's writings

The writings of Philo consist of over fifty separate treatises. Originally these were probably parts of a few larger works but the way in which they were linked is unknown. The best edition of Philo's works is found in the Loeb Classical Library in which he occupies nine volumes.

His writings may be divided into two classes, the political and the exegetical. The former consists of his treatise on Flaccus, governor of Egypt, and the account of his embassy to Caius.

His exegetical works may be roughly divided into two groups, although there can be no hard and fast rule. The first group is the allegorical and the second the non-allegorical. In the first group he departs completely from the literal text and substitutes pure allegory in its stead. Examples of this method will be found in the next section of this chapter. Some of the more important treatises in this group are: On the Creation of the World, The Allegories of the Sacred Laws, On the Cherubim, several dealing with Cain and Abel, On the Unchangeableness of God, etc.

In the second group there is a marked change of style. He departs from the allegorical method almost completely and his writings become more or less a repetition of the Biblical text. At times he lapses back into allegory but not for long. Some of the treatises in this group are, On Dreams, The Life of Abraham, The Life of Joseph, several works On

Moses, On Rewards and Punishments, On Sacrifices, several on the Decalogue under the heading of Special Laws, etc. In all his writings there is much repetition. His basic ideas are stated a dozen or more times, usually in the same general form.

4. His allegorical method

Philo was one of the world's greatest allegorical writers. Other writers noted for their use of this method were Origen and Swedenborg who will be discussed later in this thesis. Philo could draw the most ingenious suggestions from the text of the Scriptures. The extent to which he departs from the literal text may be seen from these quotations:

He goes on "for God had not rained upon the earth, and there was no man to work the ground." These words discover a deep knowledge of the laws of being. For if God does not shower upon the senses the means of apprehending objects presented to them, neither will the mind have anything to work, or take in hand in the field of sense perception....¹

"The fourth river," he says, "is Euphrates." "Euphrates" means "fruitfulness," and is a figurative name for the fourth virtue, justice, a virtue fruitful indeed and bringing gladness to the mind. When, then, does it appear? When the three parts of the soul are in harmony.²

It is not good that any man should be alone. For there are two races of men, the one made after the (Divine) Image, and the one moulded out of the earth. For the man made after the Image it is not good to be alone, because he yearns after the Image. For the image of God is a pattern of which copies are made, and every copy longs for that of which it is a copy, and its station is at its side.³

1. Philo, LA i, I, 163.

2. Ibid., 195.

3. Ibid., 227.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

PHYSICS 354

LECTURE 1

THEORY OF QUANTUM MECHANICS

LECTURER: J. J. HALL

DATE: 1998

1.1. THE SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION

1.2. THE HEISENBERG UNCERTAINTY PRINCIPLE

1.3. THE DIRAC EQUATION

1.4. THE PAULI EXCLUSION PRINCIPLE

1.5. THE SPIN-ORBIT INTERACTION

1.6. THE HYPERFINE SPLITTING

1.7. THE ZEEMAN EFFECT

1.8. THE ANOMALOUS ZEEMAN EFFECT

"On thy breast and belly shalt thou go" (Gen. iii.14). For passion has its lair in these parts of the body, the breast and the belly. When pleasure has the materials it needs to produce it, it haunts the belly and the parts below it. But when it is at a loss for these materials, it occupies the breast where wrath is; for lovers of pleasure when deprived of their pleasures grow bitter and angry.¹

These passages are sufficient to indicate the extent to which Philo allegorizes. The bulk of his writings consists of this method of interpreting the Hebrew scriptures. It never seemed to have occurred to him that his method destroyed all inspiration and meaning contained in the text, but on the contrary he considered himself to be most orthodox. The very passages he distorts were to him the inspired word of Jehovah!

Evidence for this may be seen in the following as well as in numerous other passages:

Moses, both because he had attained the very summit of philosophy, and because he had been divinely instructed in the greater and most essential part of Nature's lore.²

For Moses, through God's providence became King and lawgiver and high-priest and prophet; and in each function he won the highest place... Moses necessarily obtained prophecy also, in order that through the providence of God, he might discover what by reasoning he could not grasp...³

-
1. Philo, LA 111, I, 377.
 2. Philo, Op, I, 9.
 3. Philo, Mos II, VI, 451-3.

CHAPTER II

INFLUENCES UPON PHILO

1. The Hebrew Scriptures

1. View of God To give a complete picture of Jehovah, as he is portrayed in the Hebrew Scriptures is beyond the scope of this thesis. Such information may be found complete in any good work on Systematic Theology. Our purpose is simply to outline the main points of Hebrew theology so that we may have in mind Philo's religious background and his special religious bias.

From the day that Jehovah called Abram (later Abraham) to leave his home in Haran and to go "unto a land that I will show thee"¹, and promised Abraham that his descendents should become a great nation, the Israelites have firmly believed themselves to be an especially chosen people to fulfill a special purpose for Jehovah.² There is no lack of evidence for their holding this point of view as it is found in innumerable places in their Scriptures.³

In general, the existence of Jehovah is assumed in the Jewish revelation. However, there are some passages, mostly in the Psalms, where the writers seem to be suggesting a proof.⁴ Upon the assumption of their special divine revelation grew their conception of One God, Jehovah, and their monotheistic religion.

1. Genesis 12:1.

2. Genesis 12-50.

3. See also I Kings 3:8; I Cron. 16:13; Psalms 89:3-4, et al.

4. Psalms 98, et al..

THE
SOCIETY OF THE
SIX

OF THE SIX

The Society of the Six is a
non-profit organization dedicated to
the study and preservation of the
history and culture of the
Six Nations of the Great
Lakes. The Society was founded
in 1964 and has since
become a leading authority on
the subject.

The Society's primary focus is on
the collection and publication of
historical documents, photographs,
and other artifacts. It also
conducts research and provides
educational programs for the
public. The Society's efforts
have resulted in the discovery
of many new and important
historical facts.

The Society's publications include
the *Journal of the Society of the Six*,
which is a leading journal in the
field. The Society also publishes
a series of books on the history
and culture of the Six Nations.
These books are available for
purchase from the Society's
bookstore.

The Society of the Six is a
member of the National
Historical Society and the
National Endowment for the
Humanities. The Society is
also a member of the
International Council on the
Exploration of the Great Lakes.

The chief attributes of Jehovah are his omnipresence,¹ omniscience,² goodness,³ holiness,⁴ omnipotence,⁵ mercy,⁶ and justice.⁷ Other aspects of the divine nature might be mentioned but for our purpose they are not necessary. To the true Hebrews, Jehovah was and is the eternal and absolute God, the Creator⁸ of the universe. They, the Hebrew people, the descendants of Abraham, are his "chosen seed."

It is important to note also their anthropomorphic conception of Jehovah. He was not one who gazed upon them from far off heaven but he was a God who came down among them and entered into their everyday experiences. He helped them fight their battles, time and again he turned the tide and defeated the foe when they were especially hard pressed.⁹ He also spoke to them, gave them advice, manifested himself unto them, and guided every aspect of their lives.¹⁰ Philo was, of course, keenly aware of this view of God and also of some of its difficulties as we shall later see.

-
1. Psalms 139:7; Jeremiah 23:23-24; I Kings 8:27.
 2. Psalms 147:4; Isaiah 44:28; 46:9-10.
 3. Psalms 113:5-6, 138:2.
 4. Genesis 18:27; Deuteronomy 32:4; Psalms 97:2.
 5. Genesis 17:1; Psalms 115:3; Isaiah 44:24.
 6. Strong, ST, 289.
 7. Genesis 18:25; Deuteronomy 32:4; Psalms 97:2.
 8. Genesis 1:1-2.
 9. Judges; I Kings 18-19; Joshua 10-11.
 10. Genesis 17:1, 17, 21; 22, 32:28, 49.

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to a general discussion of the problem.

2. The second part is devoted to a detailed study of the case of a single particle.

3. The third part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

4. The fourth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

5. The fifth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

6. The sixth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

7. The seventh part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

8. The eighth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

9. The ninth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

10. The tenth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

11. The eleventh part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

12. The twelfth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

13. The thirteenth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

14. The fourteenth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

15. The fifteenth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

16. The sixteenth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

17. The seventeenth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

18. The eighteenth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

19. The nineteenth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

20. The twentieth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

21. The twenty-first part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

22. The twenty-second part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

23. The twenty-third part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

24. The twenty-fourth part is devoted to a study of the case of a system of particles.

ii. The Decalogue The foundation of Jewish law was given directly to Moses by Jehovah. Under Moses, Israel became a theocracy, subject directly to Jehovah himself through Moses whom he had appointed. Moses was the absolute ruler of the nation. Any digression from the Decalogue was punishable by death. The Israelites were to live a holy and pure life according to the direct command of Jehovah. The importance of Moses and the Mosaic code to Philo cannot be overestimated. He believed that Moses was directly inspired of God, and that his law was the divine word. He devotes two treatises to Moses in which he speaks often of the greatness of this law-giver.¹ It is strange that Philo who believed so surely in the divine inspiration of Moses would dare to turn his writings into an allegory and interpret them in a manner so vastly different from what the literal text warrants.

iii. Messianic Hope There can be no doubt but that Philo knew well the Hebrew teaching of the coming Messiah. However this does not seem to have influenced his writings to any great extent. Goodenough finds traces of the Messianic hope in the political writings of Philo, but the evidence produced is rather scanty.² There are several

1. See Section 4, Chapter I.

2. Goodenough, PPJ, 24-25, 78.

references to the promised Redeemer in the earlier books but the great bulk of the material is found in the prophetic literature.¹

iv. Prophetic writings The prophetic movement in Israel came with the spiritual, moral, and political decline of the nation. Politically, other nations were arising and preying upon the Israelites from all sides. At the same time they were fighting among themselves, with the final result of the division of the kingdom. This division further weakened the declining nation and foreign inroads became increasingly greater. In the midst of this decline, arose the prophets who warned the people of the danger and attempted to rouse them from their lethargy. The reason for the decline, according to the prophets, was the sins of the people who had broken the Mosaic law and turned to idolatry. The theocracy, begun by Moses, had been a failure; for the message of the prophets showed that the people had fallen into grievous sin and had long since departed from the code of Jehovah. The one hope of the people was to forget their sin and turn to Jehovah who was ever willing to receive them back again.²

The Messianic hope stands out strongly in most of the

-
1. Genesis 3:15; 12:1-3; 49:10; II Samuel 7:11-16; I Chronicles 17:10-14. The Messianic interpretation of all of these references is questioned by many critics.
 2. Isaiah 31:6-9; Jeremiah 3:19-22; 4:1, et al.

prophetic writings.¹ Another important teaching was the promise of an everlasting peace, a time when men should throw away their weapons of destruction and turn forevermore to the peaceful pursuits of life.² They foresaw a day when peace should come with righteousness and justice through the one whom Jehovah should send.³

2. Alexandrian Thought

The development of Alexandrian thought before the time of Philo is taken up by Drummond in his two volume work, Philo Judaeus. This is by far the most complete consideration of the subject available in English. Drummond holds that the influence of Greek Philosophy before Philo is very slight. In this position he is supported by Inge.⁴

The first work considered by Drummond is the Septuagint, the well known Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, which appeared about 280 B.C. Both Drummond and Inge hold that certain changes in the Masoretic text are not because of Greek influence but are attempts to remove some of the anthropomorphisms present in the original text. It is quite possible, however, that this Greek influence hastened the Jewish consciousness of these discrepancies in their text. In Joshua 4:24, the "power" of God is substituted for the "hand" of God. Then in Isaiah 6:1, "his glory" is found

1. Isaiah 9, 11, 61; Micah 5:2; Zechariah 12-13.

2. Isaiah 2:1-4; Micah 4:1-5.

3. Isaiah 9:6-7; 11:1-10.

4. Inge, Art.(1908), 908.

in place of "his robe." Another passage is Exodus 23:9-10, where the text is changed from "seeing the Lord" to "seeing the place where he stood."¹ On this question Drummond quotes Zeller in support of his own contention, "As Zeller points out, they are quite inadequate to prove that the doctrines of Philo had already come into existence."² On the basis of his study Drummond concludes that in so far as the Septuagint is concerned, it is simply evidence that the Jew had reached the point where he could translate the sacred Scriptures into the language of a profane culture and remove a few of the anthropomorphisms in so doing.³ Drummond then turns to a consideration of the Judo-Alexandrian Literature, which consists of four main works, The Sibylline Oracles, The Book of Wisdom, The Letter of Aristeas, and The Fragments of Aristobulus.

The Sibylline Oracles outline the central truths of Judaism with special emphasis upon monotheism. "There is but one true God, who is alone in his superlative greatness, and to whom alone worship ought to be paid."⁴ Inge says:

The Sibylline Oracles are proof of the growing respect for Greek thought and religion since it attempts to support the Jewish monotheism and national hopes with heathen prophecy.⁵

-
1. Inge, Art.(1908), 909.
 2. Drummond, PJ, I, 158.
 3. Drummond, PJ, I, 156-166.
 4. In Drummond, PJ, I, 171.
 5. Inge, Art.(1908), 912.

Both conclude that the evidence for Alexandrian thought is slight.

The Book of Wisdom is somewhat like Hebrew poetry in form. There are signs of ideas borrowed from the philosophical schools. Drummond points out that the dating of the work (which may be a collection) is uncertain. Again he discounts its value as a source of Alexandrian thought, although there are traces of the allegorical method.

The most important statement found there is what seems to be a departure from the Hebrew teaching of "creatio ex nihilo" in favor of the Platonic view of a pre-existing material out of which the universe was formed. "God created the universe out of formless matter."¹ Yet there is striking similarity between this and Genesis 1:1-2. Matter itself is compared with a lump of wax which is capable of receiving impressions, for it reads "the whole creation in its kind was again impressed anew." The author marvels at the beauty and order of the world. "He arranged all things by measure and number and weight."² Although the universe is the creation of God, he remains transcendent above it. "The whole cosmos before him is as a weight out of a balance, and as an early drop of dew when it has come down upon the earth."³ This shows the transiency of the world as con-

1. In Drummond, PJ, I, 188.

2. In Drummond, PJ, I, 188.

3. Op. cit., I, 189.

trusted with the timelessness of God. God is revealed in two ways, by the universe (his works), and by the spiritual faculties within, which are dependent on moral purity. There is evidence of the Hebrew anthropomorphic view of God, for the author speaks of him as laughing, that "none can resist the might of his arm," and again we read "the all-powerful hand created the cosmos." There is no evidence of intermediary powers.¹

To the author of Wisdom the body is not a part of the personality, but a passing phase of the soul's existence. Thus, the body becomes a hindrance and a burden, something that weighs down the soul.² This is a form of the Gnostic heresy. Wisdom itself is synonymous with righteousness. To know wisdom is to know immortality. Again we read, "wisdom is the fear of the Lord." The relation of the Spirit (of God) to the Wisdom (of God) is shown by the following quotation:

In some analogous way in the supersensible world, which can be described only through figures borrowed from the sensible, the Spirit emanates from God, and exhibits to the reason of man the impress of Wisdom in every part of creation; yet this ray, streaming from the divine glory, and reflected in material things, is inseparable from God, and were it possible to imagine him withdrawn, the Spirit would vanish at the same instant and the cosmos relapse into chaos.³

He mentions the Logos three times, twice it is parallel

1. In Drummond, PJ, I, 199.

2. Op. cit., I, 202.

3. Op. cit., I, 218; :

with wisdom.¹ In the third place the Logos is personified, for the Logos is the Angel of Death who is sent from heaven to destroy the first born of the Egyptians.² Thus the way is being prepared for Philo's doctrine of the Logos.

The dating of The Letter of Aristeas is also very uncertain. Since the material in it is of practically no value for our purpose, it can safely be ignored.

The Fragments of Aristobulus³ is also of very uncertain date. Drummond holds that the dating is much later than is claimed. This work explains the anthropomorphisms of the scriptures by calling them figures of speech. God is invisible, he says, and can only be discerned through the mind. The work need not be further considered here.

3. Greek Philosophers

Here it is our purpose to state briefly the most important teachings of the various Greek philosophers who had any influence upon Philo. This is not intended to be a complete interpretation by any means, but is given only to show the use he made of Greek thought. In subsequent chapters reference will be made to specific instances where the influence of the Greek thinker is evident.

1. In Drummond, PJ, I, 226; Book of Wisdom, 9:1-2, 16:12, 18:14-16.

2. Ibid., 227.

3. Ibid., 242-55

i. The Pythagoreans Pythagoras, the founder of this school flourished during the early part of the sixth century before Christ.¹ It is difficult to say how much of the thought of this school should be attributed to him and how much to his followers. So far as we know he believed in the transmigration of the soul and the doctrine that the body is the tomb of the soul which was later to be so well developed by the Gnostics. He also developed the theory of number as the first principle of the universe.² Indeed the school is of first importance in the history of mathematics and astronomy, for the "Pythagorean theorem" may be traced back to this early thinker. Today it is generally held that Pythagoras was the greatest of all the pre-Socratics. Plato found in his teachings the beginning of his famous "Ideas", for long before Plato's time Pythagoras asked, "the question arises whether the number which we are to suppose each one of these things to be is identical with the number which is found in the heavens..."³ Plato systematically developed and carried to its completion this suggestion from Pythagoras.

ii. Heraclitus Heraclitus lived and flourished around 500 B.C.⁴ His dates are roughly 540-475 B.C.⁵ Drummond says that with reference to the doctrine of the cosmical Logos,

-
1. Allman, Art.(1910), 698.
 2. Bakewell, BAP, 36.
 3. Ibid., 40.
 4. Ibid., 28.
 5. Mitchell, Art.(1910), 309.

the Stoics and Heraclitus are more important to Philo than Plato and Aristotle.¹ Heraclitus teaches that the fundamental fact about nature is change or flux. The universe is eternal but "everything is and is not." Because of this idea of constant change, he found the ultimate cause of the universe in fire. "But the primordial fire is in itself the divine rational process, the harmony of which constitutes the law of the universe."² Again he says, "But although the Word (Logos) is common to all, yet most men live as if each had a private wisdom of his own."³ So far as we know then Heraclitus first suggested the doctrine of an eternal Logos which had such an important place in later philosophical and theological development.

iii. Empedocles The dates of this thinker are given as 490-430 B.C.⁴ His special contribution to philosophy was his idea that there are four elements, earth, air, water, and fire, out of which everything was made. These four are brought into union or separated from each other by two forces, love and hate (attraction and repulsion). The substances of the universe are formed out of various combinations of these four elements which are themselves unchangeable.⁵

1. Drummond, PJ, I, 27.

2. Mitchell, Art.(1910) 309.

3. Bakewell, SBAP, 28.

4. Wallace, Art.(1910), 344-5.

5. Bakewell, SBAP, 43-44, 46-47; Wallace, Art.(1910), 344.

iv. Plato Plato, the greatest of all the ancient philosophers, lived from 427-347 B.C.¹ His thought is so vast that we can only mention him in passing. His philosophy centers around the "Theory of Ideas". Material things are not in themselves real but are only copies of the real things which exist in the world of Ideas. The supreme Idea is the Good to which all physical things can in some way be related. Philo makes constant use of this Platonic idea in all his writings. The world was first formed in the mind of God and from that world as a pattern the physical world was made.²

v. Aristotle The great pupil and successor of Plato flourished at Athens from 384-322 B.C.³ Central in his thought is the Four Causes to which Philo makes specific reference at least once.⁴ Aristotle is well known for his teleological conception of nature and the universe. Everything has a purpose or a use to which it is put. Nature itself is a process of becoming. It is a change from the potential to the actual. To bring about this change there is the "First Mover" or "Pure Form". The whole movement of nature is purposive, "nature does nothing in vain."

vi. The Stoics The school of the Stoics was founded by Zeno at Athens about 300 B.C. and continued into the Christian era.⁵ After the death of Aristotle came a decline in the Greek school perhaps due to the rise of Rome as much as anything else.

1. Bakewell, SBAP, 148.

2. Campbell, Art.(1910), 808-25; Bakewell, SBAP, 160-8.

3. Bakewell, SBAP, 217; Case, Art.(1910), 501.

4. Cher., II, 83.

5. Hicks, Art. (1910), 942.

The interest of philosophy turned to the question of salvation with the various schools each giving a different answer. The Stoics believed that nothing could happen contrary to the nature of the universe nor to our own spirit. Man must adjust himself to the universe, he must become a part of the whole, then he would achieve salvation. Man must bring his will into conformity with the whole.

vii. Epicureans The Epicurean school was founded by Epicurus shortly after 300 B.C.¹ His philosophy was based mainly upon an Hedonistic ethics. Salvation is found through seeking pleasure intelligently. In metaphysics he followed the materialistic atomist Democritus and most of the adherents of this school have been materialists. They held that if there was a God he did not concern himself with man so there was no use in bothering about him. Philo of course opposed strongly the atheistic teaching of this school and makes numerous references to those who taught their doctrines of materialism.

With this brief survey of the Greek philosophers whom Philo mentions we turn to a consideration of the teachings of Philo himself.

1. Wallace, Art.(1910), 683.

CHAPTER III

GOD, THE WORLD, AND THE SOUL

1. God

The existence of Jehovah is assumed by Philo and nowhere does he attempt to prove the Eternal One. "But he is not apprehensible even by the mind save for the fact that he is."¹ He goes even further and declares that we can say nothing whatsoever concerning Jehovah other than his existence. He asks, "Who can make a positive assertion concerning his essence, quality, state, or movement?"² This follows very naturally his statement that we cannot know God except through the soul, "Only the true unchanging soul has access to the unchanging God and (the soul) stands very near to divine power."³ We cannot have any sense knowledge or even intelligible knowledge of God but only such knowledge as God chooses to impart to us through the soul which is very near unto him. In spite of the fact that he maintains we can know only God's existence, Philo himself assigns numerous attributes to Deity.

In another passage he says that God is "active cause" while the cosmos is "passive object."⁴ This is obviously Platonic. Philo was influenced by Plato's Demiurge and receptacle, although his cosmos does not correspond to Plato's receptacle.

-
1. Deus, III, 41.
 2. L.A. iii, I, 441.
 3. Post., II, 337.
 4. Op., I, 9-11.

Again we read, God is the 'unoriginate' the one who was from eternity.

11. Attributes Although Philo maintains in many passages that we cannot know God other than his existence, he calmly assigns to him all the attributes of Jehovah which are found in the Hebrew Scriptures. God is omnipotent for he speaks of "the mighty sway of his sovereign power."¹ He is also omniscient for with him there is no past, present, nor future, for he sees all things simultaneously.²

For God's life is not time but eternity which is the archetype and pattern of time, and in eternity there is no past, present, nor future, but only present existence.³

He is endowed with complete foreknowledge as well:

For God the Maker of living beings knoweth well the different pieces of his handiwork even before he had thoroughly chiselled and consummated them and the faculties they are to display at a later time, in a word their deeds and experiences.⁴

He employs the forethought and foreknowledge which are virtues peculiarly his own and suffers nothing to escape his control or pass outside his comprehension--nothing is future nor uncertain to God.⁵

Philo holds to both the immanence and transcendence of God yet at the same time he avoids pantheism as the following passages show:

-
1. Op., I, 35.
 2. Op., I, 13.
 3. Deus, III, 27.
 4. L.A. iii, I, (check between 301-441)
 5. Deus, III, 25.

For God fills and penetrates all things and has left no space void nor empty of his presence.¹

To God alone is it given to be everywhere and nowhere at the same time.²

He is not contained in the universe so is nowhere, yet he is everywhere through his power.³

God fills the universe by extending himself to the utmost bounds in accordance with laws of harmony but though transcending and being beyond what he made, none the less he has filled the universe with himself.⁴

He then likens God to an invisible light which permeates all things. "He surveys the unseen even before the sun for he himself is the archetypal essence of which myriads of rays are the effervescence none visible to sense all to mind."⁵ God is also the supreme judge of the universe for, "God's goodness is the measure of all good, his sovereignty of its subjects, he himself of all things material and spiritual."⁶ It is also interesting to notice that Dante in The Divine Comedy, pictures God as a point of light, which he alone, for one moment, is permitted to see.

One of the most interesting statements about God is his eternal peace and joy. God alone of all things has perfect joy, "To him alone is given to enjoy the peace which has no element of war."⁷ In other passages he maintains that God

-
1. L.A. 111, I, 301.
 2. Conf., IV, 83.
 3. Ibid, 85.
 4. Post, II, 337.
 5. Cher., II, 67.
 6. Sac., II, 39.
 7. Cher., II, 23.

alone is perfectly motionless so has perfect rest and peace. God is unchangeable for "there is one that neither causes motion nor experiences it, the original Ruler and Sovereign."¹

The God of Philo like the Jehovah of Israel is All in All. We can sum up his position best by quoting some other passages:

He himself is to himself all that is most precious, kinsman, intimate, friend, virtue, happiness, blessedness, knowledge, understanding, beginning, end, whole, everything, judge, decision, counsel, law, process, sovereignty.²

Whose house shall be prepared for God, the King of kings, the Lord of all, Who in his tender mercy and loving kindness has deigned to visit created being and come down from the boundaries of heaven to the utmost ends of the earth to show his greatness to our race?³

For if the uncreated, the incorruptible, the eternal, who needs nothing and is Maker of all, the Benefactor, and King of kings, and God of gods...⁴

It is his special property to find a way where no way is.⁵

There are some new developments which are not found in the Hebrew Scripture to which we now turn. First of all there is the relationship of God to the human soul. According to Philo, when God created man "He breathed into him from above his own Deity."⁶ The invisible Deity is stamped

-
1. Op., I, 81.
 2. L.A. iii, I, 441.
 3. Cher., II, 69.
 4. Decal., VII, 27.
 5. Mos., VI, 365.
 6. Det., II, 261.

upon the invisible soul! It is because of this that man is able to apprehend the existence of God. Philo could be called an Apriorist.

2. World

1. The cosmos The universe we have seen is but the "passive object", (Plato's receptacle), the result of the "active mind", (Plato's demiurge), of God. All that is, came into being so it is "genesis" or "becoming."¹ All this took place in an orderly fashion for Philo holds that this is all that is meant by the six days of creation in Genesis I.² He soon departs from the literal text of Genesis to show us how the creation "actually" took place.

First of all God formed the intelligible world and from this world as a pattern God created the visible cosmos. "For God assumed that a beautiful copy would never be produced apart from a beautiful pattern."³ This is one of the clearest instances of Platonism in Philo's writings. God first formed the world within his own mind and from that pattern the sense world was made! "The whole world," he says, "is a copy of the Divine Image."⁴

There is also one marked instance of the influence of Aristotle upon Philo for he was not wholly satisfied with the Platonic explanation but took Aristotle's as well. In a single passage he takes over completely the Four Causes

-
1. Op., I, 11-13.
 2. Det., 13; Op., 13-15
 3. Ibid, 15.
 4. Ibid, 17-19.

and then mentions them no more. This type of treatment is so different from Philo's general use of other writers that it seems doubtful whether he ever wrote it. However, none of the critics questions its validity. God needed four things which must co-operate in the production of anything the "by which" (Efficient cause), the "from which" (Material cause), the "through which" (Formal cause), and the "for which" (Final cause). Thus, in building a house, there must be the co-operation of, (1) the architect, (2) stones and timber, (3) the instruments. Now, the architect is the cause by which the house is made, the stones and timber are the 'matter' from which the building is made, the instruments are the things through which it is made, and (4) the reason of its being made is to afford shelter and protection.

He goes on to apply this to the formation of the visible cosmos saying:

Passing from particular things, look at the production of that greatest of all buildings or cities, the world, and you will find that God is the cause by whom it has been produced, that the matter is the four elements from which it is put together, and the instrument is the Logos of God through which it has been formed, and the reason of its existence is the goodness of the Creator.¹

As mentioned in chapter II, Philo believed in Pre-existing elements (four in number, earth, air, fire, and water, as suggested by Empedocles) out of which God formed the cosmos.²

1. Cher., II, 83.

2. Plato, Timaeus 32C; Chapter II, this thesis.

Concerning the actual construction of the universe he becomes speculative, for example:

First He made two sections, heavy and light, thus distinguishing the element of the dense from that of rare particles; then again he divided each of these two, the rare into air and fire, the dense into water and land; and these four he laid down as first foundations to be the sensible elements of the sensible world.¹

The extent to which he carries this may be seen from the following:

God divides "material objects into life and lifeless, life into rational and irrational, rational into mortal and immortal, irrational into wild and domestic, mortal into man and woman."²

The Word (Logos) is the instrument of God in the act or process of creation but God himself is the Power and the Cause.³ "The whole universe is a rain which fell from Him."⁴

11. Dependence on God Philo is no Deist. He does not believe that God created the universe and then proceeded to ignore it. On the contrary he believed that God was, and is, in complete control of the universe at all times. To quote him:

God hath set the stars in the heavens yet he has kept the entire control for himself. He has in no case trusted the reins to the driver, fearing that their rule might be one of discord but he hath made all things dependent on himself holding that thus would the march be orderly and harmonious.⁵

1. Det., IV, 349.

2. Ibid, 353.

3. Fug., V, 61.

4. Ibid., 117.

5. Cher., II, 23.

Here it is interesting to pause and compare Paul's statement concerning Christ:

For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist.¹

Both reach this conclusion because both believed in an Absolute God (for Paul of course Christ was the Incarnate Son). In the words of a familiar hymn we might express the feeling of both, "That though the wrong seems oft so strong, God is the Ruler yet." The safety of the cosmos then at all times depends upon the Creator of the universe, God himself, the Jehovah of the Israelites.

iii. Mind of the Universe Philo also likens God in the universe to the soul in man. God is in a certain sense the mind of the cosmos. Indeed Philo says; "For we may conceive of God as the soul of the universe."² Drummond says that to Philo God is above all a rational being, "He is accordingly the Mind or Reason of the universe."³ When we take up the powers we shall find that God's Goodness and Sovereignty are always subject to his Reason. Reason is the controlling factor in all that God does as well as the intermediary through which he man-

1. Colossians 1:16-17.

2. Op., I, 209; Mig., IV, 199.

3. Drummond, PJ, II, 183.

ifests himself. He goes on to compare God in the universe with the mind in man, "For the human mind evidently occupies a position in men precisely answering to that which the Great Ruler occupies in all the World."¹ Philo sees the striking similarity of the macrocosm and the microcosm.

3. Soul

1. Pre-existence and immortality The subject of pre-existence does not seem to have troubled Philo greatly. There is no reference to this question in his writings or so it seems after a careful search for references. On the other hand the subject of immortality is dealt with in numerous places. Nor is there any question about his position. Philo did not believe that all souls were necessarily immortal. A soul may die through sin. Philo says, "the death of the soul is the decay of virtue and the bringing in of wickedness."² Again we read, "The only hope is through self-mastery which is given to the one who is loved of God."³ However the death of the body is quite possible and indeed it is to be desired for when the body dies the soul is free to return unto God. Here is a very definite suggestion of the doctrine to be so fully developed by the Gnostics.⁴ The idea that the body was the prison house of the soul was to be one of the most

1. Op., I, 57.

2. L.A. i, I, 217.

3. Ibid., 275.

4. Ibid., 219.

deeply rooted and persistent heresies of the early Christian Church. On the subject of immortality Philo also says, "By means of reverence to God, the highest of the virtues, the soul attains to immortality."¹ How then does the soul lose its opportunity to be immortal and die? Philo has a very simple answer. It is through pleasure. Pleasure is the deadly enemy of the soul; it is that which weans it away from God. He says, "Reason enamoured by pleasure becomes a subject and hence mortal instead of immortal."² Immortality is of course linked with the question of salvation, for the immortal soul is alone saved. Philo says that salvation is attained "when the soul in all utterances and all actions has attained to perfect sincerity and godlikeness, the voices of the senses cease and all those abominable sounds that used to vex it!"³ The soul must find the source of all its actions in God before it becomes immortal and is finally saved.

11. Relation to God It is the natural and proper thing for the soul to acknowledge its dependence upon God as the Creator and Ruler of the universe. The soul can produce absolutely nothing of itself. Everything comes from and is dependent upon the Creator. The soul (or mind) of man was made after the pattern of the eternal mind in the

1. Op., I, 123.

2. Ibid., 131.

3. L.A. iii, I, 331.

Ideas.¹ It is the connecting link between man and God for it is through the soul that man gains his knowledge of God. But it is even then, only such knowledge as God desires to reveal unto man for the soul cannot apprehend the Almighty in itself. "Only the true and unchangeing soul has access to the unchangeing God and stands very near to Divine power."² The soul is the earthly dwelling place of God, "Justly and rightly then shall we say that in the invisible soul the invisible God has His earthly dwelling place."³ The Genesis account tells us, "And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."⁴ Philo says that, "He (God) breathed into him from above his own Deity."⁵ Thus the invisible God stamped on the invisible soul the impression of itself so that the world would not be without a share in his image. The instrument in the formation of the soul is, of course, the Word, the eternal Logos. The Logos is for Philo the necessary connecting link between the Infinite and the Finite. "For it is the mind of man which has the form of God, being shaped into conformity with the ideal archetype, the Word (Logos) which is above all."⁶

iii. Spirit Philo uses "Spirit" in two senses. In

-
1. L.A. i, I, 207.
 2. Post., II, 339.
 3. Cher., II, 69.
 4. Genesis 2:7.
 5. Det., II, 261.
 6. Spec., VII, 605.

general, however, he does not make a practice of using the term at all, for it seldom appears in his writings. Once he uses Spirit as synonymous with the Word or Logos. He says, "The soul of man is made by the Spirit, the Divine and invisible One, signed, sealed, by his stamp--the Eternal Word."¹ The second time he uses it with reference to man. God breathed into man something which he calls Spirit. "And clearly what was then thus breathed was ethereal spirit, or something, if such there be, better than ethereal spirit, even an effulgence of the blessed, thrice blessed nature of the God-head."² It is evident from this that Philo was not at all sure what had happened at creation. Certainly he thought that God had imparted unto man something of his own life or spirit but what that something was and just how the act took place he was not at all sure.

iv. Relation to Mind It is necessary for us now to consider Philo's conception of the human soul. He believed that it was divided into three more or less distinct parts, yet these parts could act upon and influence each other. He does not always use the same names to describe these parts but his meaning is perfectly clear. The three main divisions of the soul are, mind, sense, and passion. The idea of a three-fold soul is obviously Platonic, although Philo's divisions do not exactly correspond to Plato's reason, spirit, and appetite. Two of these are in turn sub-divided as

1. Conf., IV, 23.

2. Virt., VIII, 85.

we shall see. He sometimes uses the term "soul" as synonymous with "mind" thus care must be taken so as not to confuse the two. We now quote some passages in which he describes the soul:

And again the soul the reasoning faculty is first... so to of the virtues, first is prudence which has its sphere in the first part of the soul which is the domain of reason...second is courage, for it has its seat in high spirit, the second part of the soul,...and third the lustful faculty to which has been assigned the third part of the soul.¹

In other passages he speaks of them as:

The princely part was created first by God, the irrational parts are younger, the senses and the passions.²

Our soul is tripartite having one part assigned to the mind and reason, one to the spirited element, and one to the appetites...³

In his explanation of the soul we find also one of his best allegorical passages. When the Scriptures speak of the creation of Adam what is really meant is "mind". Then he continues, Eve really means "sense" for sense is the helpmate of the mind. Since mind (Adam) was given control over sense (Eve), this is the proper and natural relationship. If mind (Adam) ever comes under the control of, or becomes subject to sense (Eve), then it at once abandons God and is in danger of being lost. To continue the figure

1. L.A. i, I, 193-5.

2. L.A. ii, I, 229-31.

3. Conf., IV, 23.

the serpent enters the scene, for the serpent is "pleasure". Pleasure (serpent) tempts sense which is in danger now of coming under the control of the passions and so leading to the destruction of the whole soul. Unless the unnatural course of events is checked at once the mind may lose control of itself, become subject to sense, and the end will be the death of the soul.¹

The proper place of the senses is to aid the mind. They alone can distinguish color, sound, etc., and communicate this information to the mind. The passions also have their proper place in informing the mind of pain, anger, etc., but woe to the mind that becomes subject to any of these. The parts into which sense is divided have already been intimated, they are, the five senses, speech, and the power of generation (reproduction).² The lustful faculty or passion is made up of the various emotions to which the human personality is subject.

It goes almost without saying that the mind is the important part of the soul. When the mind is in proper control then the soul is in complete harmony. When harmony reigns in the soul it shows that "reason" is in control and justice is the result. If the senses gain control then of course injustice rules supreme.³

"Mind", he says, "is a vast and receptive storehouse

1. L.A. i, I, 271.

2. Agr., III, 123.

3. L.A. i, I, 195.

in which all that comes through sight and hearing and the other organs of sense is placed and treasured."¹ It is, in other words, the sight of the soul. It is a branch of the soul, but not the soul itself. It is formed out of elements different than the other branches and composed of "the substance of which divine natures were wrought."² Of all the things which God created, to the mind alone he gave a measure of freedom or free-will.

v. Reason Knowledge cannot be obtained through the senses according to Philo. "By means of sense we gain impressions only of the material forms of things."³ That is we can only know phenomena and never the Dinge an sich by means of the senses. We can however, obtain knowledge through Reason which is always present when there is harmony in the soul. It would seem, then, that Philo believed in an a priori knowledge only, and such as is imparted to us directly by God. It is evident that he had no faith whatsoever in man's reason unless the divine factor was present. "If we repose our trust in our own reasonings, we shall construct and build a city of the mind that corrupts truth."⁴ But from his position it appears that the harmonious soul is always in tune with God, and that true knowledge is quite possible to one who possesses such a soul. The ability to comprehend and to understand is dependent upon the

-
1. Deus, III, 31.
 2. Ibid., 33.
 3. L.A. III, I, 375.
 4. Ibid., 457.

rationality of the soul as a whole. This depends upon how free the soul is from sense control, as we have seen, and how near it is to the natural influence of God.

Chapter IV

THE LOGOS

1. Logos before Philo

We have already mentioned the changes in the text of the LXX mainly for the purpose of removing some of the anthropomorphisms contained in the Masoretic text. We have seen how the writers or translators substituted the "Word of the Lord" for the "Lord" in several cases.

It is interesting to notice in this connection the use of the "Word" in Targumic Literature. A very brief but interesting consideration of this subject is found in the Jewish Quarterly Review¹ of which the following is a brief summary. In one passage the translator says that the Word (Dibbura) emerged from the right hand of God and went to the left of Israel; thence returning it surrounded the camp of Israel (reference is to the (pillar of fire" which guided the Israelites out of Egypt and through the wilderness). Then in a passage in the Midrash (6:3 on Cant. 5:16) the Dibbura is the intermediary of revelation and is represented as interceding before God on behalf of the Israelites who have been reduced to a state of panic by the utterances of the voice of God at Mount Sinai. "When the divine voice uttered and the Israelites heard this word," says the Midrash, "their souls fled." In another passage

1. Box, Art.(1932-33), 103.

which has reference to Deut. 5:25, "If we hear the voice of God anymore, then we shall die.", we read that the Dibbura returns to the Holy One and speaks these words, "Thou art living and eternal and Thy law is living and eternal and Thou hast sent me to the dead." This passage is also very clearly a Personification of the Dibbura similar to that of Wisdom in Proverbs. To sum up, Kohler says:

Just as the references to God's appearing to man suggested luminous powers mediating the vision of God, so the passages which represent God as speaking suggested powers mediating the voice. Hence arose the conception of the Divine Word invested with Divine powers both physical and spiritual. The first act of God in the Scripture is that he speaks and by this word the world came into being. The word was thus conceived of as the first created being an intermediary power between the Spirit of the world and the created world order. Hence the older Haggadah places beside the Shekinah the Divine Word (Heb., Maamar; Aramaic, Memra; Greek, Logos) as the intermediary force of revelation.¹

It is easy to see then in the light of this, why Isaiah 45:15 becomes in the Targum "I by my Word (memra) have made the earth." Also in Exodus 13:15, it is the Word, not Jehovah, which hardens Pharaoh's heart. But to what extent the "Word" was thought of as an intermediary power before the time of Philo remains in dispute. In his article in the Catholic Encyclopædia, Lebreton claims that the Word in the Targum differs entirely from that of Philo's use, while the article by Kohler suggests the opposite. Drummond and Inge support the position of Lebreton.

1. Kohler, JT, 198; Box, Art.(1932-33).

We have also referred to the presence of the Logos in Greek philosophy. Heraclitus was the first to use the term so far as we know in this special sense. He believed that the first principle of all things was the unchanging fire which causes all things to change continually, yet remains permanent through the four basic and unchanging elements.

He saw in all this what he called the Law and Order of change, or the Intelligible Structure of the Universe. This he called the Logos. Further the only real and permanent knowledge which comes to us is through the Logos which is alone eternal in the Universe.

After Heraclitus came Anaxagoras who was also interested in the problem of change. He concluded that there was a dualism in the Universe, consisting of a more or less inert substance and an intelligible principle, the latter being the cause of all motion. He called this eternal intelligible principle Mind (Nous) and this corresponds to the Logos of Heraclitus.

Plato united all the threads of thought which came down to him from many thinkers before his day and worked out a systematic philosophy. Behind the physical world he said lies the real world, the World of Ideas. In his world all things are related to the supreme Idea, the Good, or we might say God. He saw that behind the physical universe was something vastly greater than just Logos or Nous, there

was personality. The influence of Plato upon Philo cannot be overestimated for to him all creation is but a copy of the eternal world which exists in the mind of God.

Philo would agree with Aristotle's idea that God is pure intelligence or form. However he arrived at his conclusion in a vastly different way for he believed in Jehovah as the supreme being and Creator of all that is. For Aristotle there is matter which is becoming Form and this Philo would deny.

2. Philo's view

Reference has already been made to the article on the Logos by Lebreton. With reference to Philo he says,

The Memra resembles the Logos of Philo as little as the workings of the rabbinical mind in Palestine resembles the speculations of Alexandria. They used it to attribute actions indirectly to Yaweh while for Philo it was between God and the Universe.¹

For Philo the Logos is the instrument of the Divine Will. It is the intermediatery between the Creator and the creation, the instrument through which God performs all of his acts. He likens the universe to a great chariot which has a driver to hold the reins but also a rider who gives the instructions to him. Philo says, "The Logos is the driver of the powers...he who speaks (God) is the rider and he (God) gives orders to the driver and so rules the universe."² The Logos is supreme among the powers but he is subject to

1. Lebreton, Art.(1910), 329.

2. Cher., I, 9.

God. Drummond says in his great work:

The Logos in the universe which answers to the uttered logos in man, and may therefore be described as the Word of God, is the impress of the supreme idea upon matter, the rational force which binds the multitude of phenomena into the harmony and unity of a cosmos.¹

The Logos or rational Power is wholly dependent upon God even for existence, while the universe and all that it contains is dependent upon the Logos which stands midway between God and his creation. Again Philo says:

The Father who generated the universe gave a special gift that standing on the borders it (Logos) should separate the created from the Creator.²

God's shadow is his Word which he made use of like an instrument and so made the world. But this shadow is the archetype for further creations. For just as God is the pattern of the Image, to which the title of shadow has just been given, even so the Image becomes the pattern of other beings.³

For Philo then the Logos is even more than an intermediary, he is also the pattern of creation. We would say that the creation conforms wholly to the law of Reason which is as eternal as the cosmos, while in Philo's language the same thought is expressed by saying that the creation is the image of the Logos or Word of God.

There is no doubt that Philo saw God as the supreme Lord and Sovereign of the universe. For him the harmony and order of the entire creation depended upon the constant

1. Drummond, PJ, II, 179.

2. Her., 42.

3. L.A. iii, I, 365.

control and supervision of God. He says:

God hath set the stars in the heaven yet he has kept the entire control for himself. He has in no case trusted the reins to the driver fearing that his rule might be one of discord, but he hath made all things dependent on himself holding that thus would their march be orderly and harmonious.¹

God is then the Creator and Ruler of the cosmos. The Logos is the rational instrument of divine will upon which it is always and completely dependent.

Since the mind is the rational principle in man there is naturally a close connection between it and the Logos. "For it is the mind of man which has the form of God, being shaped in conformity with the ideal archetype, the Word that is above all."² It is the Logos who placed Reason in control of the human faculty "knowing the strength of spirit and pleasure."³ The Logos is really two-fold in Philo's thought. "The Word is the whole mind of God, considered as travelling outside itself, and expressing itself in act."⁴ It is quite evident from his treatment that he makes the Logos both the Reason of God and the Instrument of the divine Will. The latter is especially evident in creation. Philo himself says this very clearly in a passage:

The Logos is two-fold in the universe and in the nature of man. In the universe there is, on the

-
1. Cher., II, 23.
 2. Spec., iii, VII, 605.
 3. L.A. iii, I, 379-81.
 4. Bigg., CPA, 16.

one hand, the logos which has to do with the incorporeal and archetypal ideas constituting the intelligible cosmos, and, on the other hand, the logos which is concerned with visible things, - these being copies and imitations of the ideas from which the visible cosmos has been fashioned. In man, again, there is, on the one hand, the inner reason (Logos) and, on the other hand, the outer reason (Logos). The former is like a fountain, the latter, the expressed Logos, is like the stream which flows from it. The one is situated in the ruling part, the other - that which is expressed - is in the tongue and mouth and the other organs of speech.¹

This two-fold aspect of the Logos is evident in other passages as well. The following quotation from Drummond, as he sums up his study of the subject, shows that he arrived at the same conclusion. "From first to last the Logos is the thought of God, dwelling subjectively in the infinite mind, planted out and made objective in the universe."²

The parallel between the microcosm and the macrocosm is self-evident. Thought and speech in man are related to each other, as the intelligible cosmos is related to the sensible cosmos.

To sum up the whole of Philo's doctrine of the cosmical Logos, it is evident that it is not conceived as a person but as the thought of God constituting the divine Mind, which is expressed in the rational order of the visible universe. The Logos is characterized in the following ways; (1) The Word, (2) The instrument of creation, (3) The eternally begotten, (4) the eldest or first born Son of God, (5) The man of God. He is personified as (6) the manna

1. Yonge, PJ, II, 154; Watson, PBR, 474.
2. Drummond, PJ, II, 273.

from heaven, (7) the sword that turned in every direction, (8) the cloud by the Red Sea, and (9) the rock in the wilderness. In whatever way Jehovah comes into contact and relations with his people, the Logos always appears as the instrument of divine mediation. The idea of more or less complete transcendence as suggested by Philo was later to be carried to extremes of absurdity by the Gnostics. As Watson so well says,

Philo's whole system of thought compels him to interpose the Logos between the incomprehensible and selfcontained God and man, and hence man as a rational being is the image of the Logos which is itself the image of God.¹

3. Is the Logos a personality?

A consideration of several passages in Philo might at first lead to the belief of a personal Logos. Many times he refers to the Logos as the "Son" as is seen from the following quotations:

This hallowed flock he leads in accordance with right and law, setting over it his true Word and first born son who shall take upon him its government like some viceroy of a great king.²

For the Father who begat him constituted his Word such a bond of the universe as nothing can break.³

If not sons of God we may be sons of his invisible image, the most Holy Word, for the Word is the eldest born image of God.⁴

The question which first arises is whether "Son" is

-
1. Watson, PBR, 226-7.
 2. Agr., III, 135.
 3. Plant., III, 217.
 4. Conf., IV, 91.

used only to express personal filial relationship. We know of course that it does not. For example in Job 5:7 we read, "But man is born unto trouble as the sparks (Hebrew, sons of flame) fly upward." Then in Lamentations 3:12-13, arrows are referred to as "Sons of the bow". The use of the word "son" then, does not necessarily mean filial relationship or personality. Then too, Philo himself speaks of "Time" as the "grandson" of God, since time began with the creation of the material world (not the archetype which existed first in the mind of God).¹ It is evident, then, that what he means is that since the Logos was first and nearest to God, it is thought of as his Son, while Time, being a step farther removed is God's grandson.

1. Deus, III, 25.

Chapter V

THE POWERS

1. Number of powers

It is rather hard to say definitely how many powers there were in Philo's writings. Every act of God is accomplished through a power, so there are really as many powers as God has actions. He speaks of Goodness and Sovereignty as the highest powers, the Logos, of course, being excepted. He also refers to the Creative power and the Regal or Legislative power by which God made the Laws of the Universe. Arising out of the Legislative power are two others which he calls the Perceptive, and Prohibitive.

2. Relation to the Logos

The Logos stands supreme as the ruler of the powers. Philo places reason in control of the Universe. Reason subject to the Creator and Ruler of all. "The oldest and best is the divine Logos, the other five powers of him who speaks are colonies."¹ The Jews of Philo's time knew well the meaning of a colony and its relation to the central or governing power. Roman colonies were well known and scattered over the known world.

Using the figure of the Ark of the Covenant, Philo gives us one of his most beautiful passages and shows us

1. Prof., 18-19.

well the eternal relationship of the powers.

God's one but his highest powers are two, Goodness and Sovereignty, Through his Goodness he created all things and through his Sovereignty he rules them. Between the two stands a third which unites the two. This is Reason for it is through Reason that God is both Ruler and Good.¹

Philo conceived of a world in which Reason was in control. God was supreme, it is true, but God by his very nature is subject to the Law of Reason. It is only in so far as God is reasonable that he is God. Were he anything other than subject to his own eternal Reason, then he would not be God. Such is the conception Philo has of God.

3. Purpose of each

Each power has its own distinctive purpose. The purpose of the Creative was to create; of the Regal to legislate and make the laws of the universe; of the Sovereign power to rule the universe. In order to see that these powers worked together and controlled the Universe in an orderly manner, each was made subject to the divine Reason. Taken together the powers are equivalent to the nature and essence of God. God enters the soul through his powers. Powers are then simply the device of Philo for removing God a step away from the Universe, and yet attempting in some way to explain the connection which at the same time must exist between the Infinite and the Finite.

1. Cher., II, 25.

4. Relation to each other.

It would seem from Philo's writings that the powers are completely independent of each other. Each has a special task to perform which he does subject to Reason. Since each is subject to Reason it cannot in any way interfere with the work of any other power. Concerning the Legislative power he says:

Their (Laws) motion and operations are invariably carried out under ordinances and laws which God laid down in his Universe as unalterable.¹

He is the Lawgiver and source of all law both of reward and punishment.²

5. Influence from other sources

It is quite likely that Philo was influenced by several sources in devising his rather loose and indefinite system of Powers. For one thing, there were the angels of Judaism to suggest the idea on the religious side. On the philosophical side were the Logoi of the Stoics and the Ideas of Plato. Bigg says the latter were, "The thoughts of God, the heavenly models upon earth, the types which, imprinted upon matter like a seal of wax, give to it life, reality, and durability."³ Yet the powers never exist apart from the divine source, nor are they ever independent of the Logos. They are always under the control of Reason, lest they run wild and destroy the purpose for which they were intended. The Logos is the leader and ruler of them all.

1. Op., I, 47.

2. Op., I, 49.

3. Bigg, CPA, 11.

Chapter VI

OTHER PROBLEMS AND HIS SOLUTIONS

1. Matter

1. Elements The elements are four in number, earth, fire, air, and water.¹ From these four, God made all that there is by implanting or impressing upon them the divine Reason. His treatment is, of course, not original, for these four elements were previously suggested by Empedocles, the Greek philosopher. Other Greek thinkers also made use of them.

For Philo it would seem that matter is eternal. He says it may be dissolved but this does not mean that it is destroyed, only changes.² In another passage he argues that if the Universe (everything that God created) is to be destroyed, it would have to be destroyed by either God or some other being. Now there is no other being outside of God and the Universe, and since God would not destroy his own creation, it follows that it will never be destroyed.³

2. Creation

1. The Universe God created the Universe according to the Hebrew Scriptures and of course Philo accepts this account. (Genesis 1-2) He differs radically from the materialists who hold that there was nothing prior to the

1. Plant., III, 275, et al; Det., II, 385.

2. Aet., IX, 205.

3. Ibid., 259.

Universe. He takes strong exception to some of this materialistic teaching of his day. The constellations are not the primary cause of the things which happen to men. The complete whole which we see around us is held together by an invisible power which the Creator has extended from the ends of the earth to the furtherest extremities of heaven. The powers of the universe are "chains that cannot be broken."¹ God has created all the universe out of the four elements and he has ordered all which he also sustains with his power.

The Monad is the image of the first Cause, the dyad of matter, passive and divisible. Therefore one who honors the dyad before the monad should not fail to know that he holds matter in higher esteem than God, ascribing to passive element the power of active principle.²

Again referring to materialists as those who "fill the human mind with much impiety by teaching that apart from phenomena there is no originating cause of anything whatsoever, but that the circuits of the sun, moon and stars and of the other heavenly bodies determine for every being in existence both good things and their opposites."³

Why has God done all this? Philo has a very naive answer. It is simply because of his loving kindness. This he says dispels envy and hate with virtues and moral beauty. "It is the mother of gracious deeds by which bringing into created existence things that were not, it dis-

1. Mig., IV, 237.

2. Spec. iii, VII, 589.

3. Mig., IV, 237.

plays them to view."¹ The universe is the loving handiwork of God who is the first cause. Even as the Psalmist exclaimed, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork."²

In the world is found perfect harmony, for all the opposites of nature are harmonized by love.³ Each part of the world needs all the others and together they make up an harmonious whole. The governing principle of love is interesting for it is the principle by which Empedocles makes his four elements interact. He says:

When Strife had fallen to the lowest depth of the vortex, and Love had come to be the centre of the whirl, all things came together in Love so as to be one only,...⁴

Philo evidently borrowed this idea along with the four elements.

The Creation of the Universe was not in any time for time began with the Universe. "God spake and it was done." With God there is no time but all is timeless.⁵

He again appeals to his great authority Moses who declared that the world came into being and is one for it stands to reason that all its completed several parts have the same elementary substances for their substratum, one the principle that interdependence of the parts is a characteristic of bodies which constitute a unity.⁶

1. Mig., IV, 239.

2. Psalm 19:1.

3. Cher., II, 75.

4. Bakewell, SBAP, 44.

5. Sac., II, 143.

6. Deus, III, 49.

ii. Man The creation of man takes on a dual aspect based upon the two accounts given in Genesis. With reference to man being made in the image of God, Philo says that this is in respect to the soul, "For after the pattern of a single mind, even the Mind of the Universe as an archetype, the mind in each of those who successively came into being was moulded."¹ Thus God first made the pattern after which man is to be compiled. The man then whom God formed out of the dust of the earth (Genesis 2:7) is but a copy of the archetype which was made after the divine image.² He thus Platonizes the creation of man.

There are various types of men based upon their relation to God. First of all, there are those who seek the pleasures of the flesh and these are of course separated from God hence lost in sin. Secondly, there are the lovers of learning, those who are followers of art and knowledge. These are the men who are seeking to follow the highest are seeking God, and are in general allowing reason not sense to control their souls. Lastly, there are those who have attained, those who are priests and prophets and are living wholly above the sense world. They have been translated into a world of the intelligible and dwell there "registered as free men of the Commonwealth of Ideas which are imperishable and incorporeal."³

1. Op., I, 55.

2. Ibid., 107.

3. Gig., II, 469.

Man differs from all other creatures in that he has a mind which God has given to him. He was formed last to be the governor and ruler of all creation, subject, of course, to God himself; for this reason he was given a mind. God, he says, "bestowed upon him, mind par excellence, life principle of the life principle itself."¹ "Every man in respect to his mind is allied to the divine Reason, having come into being as a copy or fragment or ray of that blessed nature, but in structure of his body he is allied to all the world."²

Man's chief end is to glorify God to whom he belongs. He seems to be free and to have a free-will, but its sole end and purpose is to serve the Creator. "I am formed mind and body, I seem to have mind, reason, and sense, yet I find none of these is really mine."³ Piety and holiness are true virtues but to attain them we must serve God.⁴ The question of free-will will be more fully considered in connection with election.

Philo's thoughts upon man are inadequate. He hardly does justice to the account of man's creation and purpose as given in Genesis, nor to the work of the Greek philosophers. The earthly man is moved a step farther away from God by Philo's dualistic interpretation of the Genesis account. From his

-
1. Op., I, 51.
 2. Ibid., 115.
 3. Cher., II, 75.
 4. Sac., II, 123.

interpretation it follows that the soul alone has intrinsic worth, while the body is practically forgotten. By means of the body, man is bound to the earth, and the soul is separated from God. On this point, Philo is like the ascetics of his day, and indeed comes close to Gnosticism.

3. Evil

Philo's explanation of the problem is both simple and unique. Since God is perfect, obviously evil could not originate with him. What then, is the explanation? In speaking of the creation of man Jehovah says, "Let us make man in our own image."¹ Clearly then, God has some helpers when he created man. The evil which is present in the world is the result of the work of the helpers. "Reason acknowledges that God is the creator of the Universe but it is unreasonable to say that he is the author of everything that concerns the life of man."² Further he says that we must draw a sharp line "and own him (God) author of the good things only."³ Philo, no doubt, found this idea in Plato also for he too places evil outside of God's field of activity.⁴ One need scarcely ask the question where God's helpers came from. It is strange if Philo did not see the absurdity and weakness of his position. Yet the problem of evil has

1. Genesis 1:26.

2. Post., III, 433

3. Op., I, 75; Plant., III, 53.

4. Timaeus, 29-41.

been a great stumblingblock to many and is still one of the most persistent problems of both philosophy and theology.

4. Election.

Closely connected with the problem of divine election is that of free-will. Concerning this Philo says, "Man possesses of a spontaneous and self-determined will, whose activities for the most part rest on deliberate choices." Philo then recognizes the individual right to choose. Why then does not God make all things right in the world. In reply he says, "If God should end war and proclaim peace we would be bright and cheerful in friendship but yet unchanged in ourselves."¹ There would be no virtue in a world in which all is right and men would have to do what they were elected to do. To continue he says, "We know we cause no good nor ill though we imagine we do. We cannot lay the voyage to the sea for it is not the sea but the wind which means success or failure."² This is a definite statement of divine election. God is as the wind and he alone guides the life on its voyage to success or failure. Philo then admits the great paradox of Scripture found both in the New and the Old Testaments.

1. God's choice of Abraham Philo finds something in his name which means "high father." But we might say that God so named him because he had chosen him to be the

1. Deus, III, 33.

2. Cher., II, 31.

father of a great race. Why then did God choose him in preference to other members of his family? Only God can answer that question, he chose him because he chose to choose him.

ii. The other patriarchs Philo says that Noah means "rest" and so he found favor with God. Melchizedek, is the King of Peace, Isaac was esteemed before his birth, by his divine foreknowledge God knew that Jacob would be superior to Esau and more rational and virtuous. But again none of these reasons are of value for none of them tell why God actually so chose, if he did choose them. Nevertheless Philo believed that God did elect each of these for his own special work and more than that we cannot say.

iii. Concerning world powers Philo firmly believed that God likewise elected nations according to his will and purpose. "Such was the fate of Flaccus also, who thereby became an indubitable proof that the help which God can give was not withdrawn from the nation of the Jews."¹ God was watching over his chosen people in spite of what seemed adversities!

It is the Logos who seals the fate of nations for:

The divine Logos, which most men call fortune (chance) moves in a circle, in constant stream, it acts upon cities and nations, assigning the possessions of one to another and those of all to all, merely exchanging the property of each

1. Fl., IX, 403.

by periods, in order that as one city, the whole habitable world may have the best government, democracy.¹

We find a similar passage in which he attributes the course of events in world history to the constant flux of the Logos. Attention is called to such world powers as Greece, Macedonia, Persia, Parthia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Carthage, Libya, and Pontus, each had to decline except Parthia which was then in power. This is not chance but clear evidence of divine dealings.² Goodenough suggests that Philo had an idea that "This flux in world power could only end in the Kingdom of God and the fulfillment of the Messianic Hope."³ This is a matter of speculation for which there is little evidence or support. It remains clear however, that Philo believed in the doctrine of divine election.

1. Deus, III, 36.

2. Aet., IX, 173-6.

3. Goodenough, PPJ, 78.

Chapter VII

INFLUENCE OF PHILO

1. New Testament

The treatment of Philo would not be complete without including a discussion of his influence upon philosophical and theological movements. Outstanding in his writings is, of course, the doctrine of the cosmical Logos, and his allegorical method. Philo lived in a time when the problem of salvation was the main discussion of the various schools. Neoplatonism, Gnosticism, Stoicism, Orthodox Christianity, and other current movements, all gave their answer to this important problem. What is the relation of Philo and his system to the other movements of his day?

In considering the relation of Philo to the New Testament it is necessary to look at the individual writers who might have come under his influence. These are the Author of Hebrews, the Author of the Fourth Gospel, and the Apostle Paul.

Some writers speak of an Alexandrine idealism and allegorism in the Book of Hebrews. It is hard to say for certain, however, that Philo was known and used by the writer of this book, although many of the phrases are similar. Bartlet says: "But Alexandrianism was a mode of thought diffused throughout the Eastern Mediterranean, and the divergence from Philo's spirit are as notable as the affinities."¹ It is quite possible that the author of Hebrews

1. Bartlet, Art.(1910), 191.

was familiar with, and made use of, Philo's style and method. Yet, it is also true that the thought of the writer is wholly in keeping with the thought and spirit of the New Testament as a whole.

In considering the relation of Philo and Paul, a comparison of their main doctrines will best illustrate their similarities and differences. Paul's chief concern in life was the salvation of the human soul. For him, salvation was attained by simple faith in Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Son of God. He saw that the whole of humanity was dead in trespasses and sin and the only hope of the individual was to be made alive through the regenerating power of Christ, to be justified from sin through the acceptance of his atoning death on the cross, and so to become reconciled unto God, not by any individual merit but by faith in Christ alone. "As in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive."¹

For Philo, salvation consists in the illumination of the mind by a rational and philosophical conception of God. The saved soul is the one which rejects the influence of sense and passion, and in so doing, becomes completely in harmony with the transcendent God of the cosmos. That which keeps man from God is the flesh - the world.

At this point there is a striking similarity between the thought of Philo and Paul. Paul's writings are filled

1. I Corinthians 15:22, et al.

with the contrast between flesh and spirit.¹ He speaks of man's spiritual body and his carnal body. The carnal man cannot know the things of the spirit. The contrast is not between the sinful or evil spirit in man and the godly spirited or saved man, but rather, between flesh and spirit. Paul tells us to crucify the flesh. Sin is linked with the flesh, righteousness with the spirit. There is much of the ascetic nature in the epistles of Paul.

The world in which Philo and Paul lived was filled with ascetics. The similarity present shows that Paul was definitely influenced by ascetic thought. It would be hard to show, however, that he was directly influenced by Philo's thought. There is little likelihood of any positive connection ever being established between them.

Philo also mentions the "rock" from which the Israelites received water in the wilderness.² With him the "rock" becomes the Logos. Paul makes reference to this same "rock" and says "They all drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ."³ While Paul had direct reference to the passage in the Hebrew Scriptures, the influence of the allegorical method is plainly visible. There are other examples in Paul's writings as well.

While there are certain similarities between Paul and Philo, there are also many differences. Philo freed himself

1. For a striking contrast, see Romans 8, et al.

2. Psalm 78:15; Exodus 17:6; Numbers 20:11.

3. I Corinthians 10:4.

from the Jewish national limitation of the elect to fall prey to the Greek intellectual one. Paul, on the other hand, saw beyond both these ideas to a fuller and greater revelation of God in the person of Christ through whom salvation is made available to all who accept him in simple faith. Paul had a universal plan of salvation not a national nor intellectual one.

Again, for Philo, the Law of Moses was something eternal and final. It was the last word of God in so far as he was concerned. Paul brushes the law aside with one sweep of his hand as something transient and temporary. It is a standard, a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. Christ, the Son of God, is the final revelation of him.

Philo's doctrine of a cosmical Logos was simply the hypostatization of an abstract Idea. It is simply the personification of the divine Reason. Paul's doctrine of Christ was living, vital, and dynamic. As a result the doctrine of Philo was doomed to perish, while that of Paul was destined to revolutionize the world. As Harnack so well says:

The center of all St. Paul's life and thought was his absolute faith that Christ had revealed himself to him, that the Gospel was the revelation of the crucified and risen Christ, and that God had called him to proclaim this Gospel to the world."¹

With this thought in view and the salvation of the world as his goal, he set out, no longer a Jew but a new

1. Harnack, DG, 89.

man in Christ. With an ever growing zeal for lost souls, he journeyed on, until finally in chains, he drove the Gospel into Rome--the heart of the world. The center of all his preaching was the living One, ~~the~~ Christ of God.

The same contrast is found between Philo's "heavenly man", his "first-born Son," and the same expression as used by Paul. Philo means simply the operation of the divine Mind, but Paul is talking about the pre-existent and incarnate Son of God.

For Philo, God remains forever transcendent above his creation, but for Paul, Christ is the manifestation of his infinite love.

The only possible conclusion is that Paul and Philo are talking about entirely different beings. It would be hard to show that Philo influenced the fundamental doctrines of Paul.

There remains but the consideration of the Fourth Gospel which claims to be the work of John the Disciple. This is especially interesting for we find the writer using the "Logos" in the Prologue to the book. "In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God."¹ The Logos is a Jewish-Alexandrian term so it is interesting to see how the writer uses it. "We do not prove that the writer of the Fourth Gospel borrowed from Philo, because both speak of the Logos as a manifestation

1. John 1:1.

of God."¹

We have seen that for Philo, God is incomprehensible. He and John would agree that "No man hath seen God at any time." But Philo means that the human mind is incapable of grasping any conception of God whatsoever, while John means that God has not yet been manifested in human form. John continues, "The only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." For John, then, the Logos was to be a revelation of God, which Philo holds to be utterly impossible.

Philo also conceived of God as a great Architect who fashioned the cosmos through the instrumentality of the Logos. For John, the Logos was identical with God, not a product of his activity; "The Logos was God." The Logos is a metaphor and the important thing is the idea which is attached to it. Watson says:

There is only one New Testament writer who was certainly acquainted with the writings of Philo, or at least with the main ideas which those writings express--the writer of the Fourth Gospel; and in him the antagonism is more fundamental than in any other writer. A comparison with Philo only goes to show more clearly the unique character of Christianity. The teaching of our Lord contained implicitly a complete theology; and when St. Paul and the other New Testament writers sought to set forth this system explicitly, they were only seeking to supply a fundamental need of the human spirit.²

Indeed the Logos in John's Prologue is but an introduction to his book and is not intended to be a basis of

1. Watson, PBR, 195.
2. Ibid., 236-7.

interpretation for the whole Fourth Gospel. Harnack says, "The Prologue is not the key to the understanding of the Gospel, but is rather intended to prepare the Hellenic reader for its perusal."¹ John's Prologue might be paraphrased in this manner: You have been talking about the Logos. You have been speculating about its nature and its relation to God. Now, I am going to tell you what the Logos really is. The Logos was from the beginning. The Logos is a manifestation of God. The Logos is God, and he has been revealed to us in the person of Jesus of Nazareth.

The purpose of the New Testament writers is not to set forth the metaphysics of the philosophical schools of the day, but rather to show that in Christ may be found a solution of the problems of life. It is to proclaim him as the supreme revelation of God to man, and the only hope of salvation for a world lost in sin. It is evident then, that these New Testament writers were influenced by the thought which was prevalent during their day. They were influenced by the allegorical method of Philo to a definite degree. They took what the world of the day offered and used it to express the new message of Christianity which they were privileged to give to a needy world. In closing this section the opinion of one who is recognized as an outstanding New Testament scholar and critic is in order:

There is not a single New Testament writing,
which does not betray the influence of the mode

1. In Dods, Art.(n.d.), 671.

of thought and general culture which resulted from the Hellenizing of the East. Indeed, this is shown by the use of the Greek translators of the Old Testament. We may even say, that the Gospel itself is historically unintelligible so long as we regard it as an exclusive product of Judaism which is in no way affected by any foreign influence. But, on the other hand, it is just as evident that specific Greek ideas neither form the pre-suppositions of the Gospel, nor of the principle New Testament writings. The writers of the New Testament breathe the spiritual atmosphere created by the Greek culture...but the religious ideas in which they live and move come to them from the Old Testament, and especially from the Psalms and the prophets.¹

The main ideas of Philo and his mode of thought, are determined by Greek Philosophy. Whatever resemblances there are between him and the New Testament writers, and these are neither few nor indefinite, it still remains true that the whole spirit and view of life is fundamentally different. The New Testament writers used what went before, while still retaining the uniqueness of the Christian message.

2. Church Fathers

Goodenough in one of his works on Philo² mentions the striking parallelism between Augustine and Philo on many points. He mentions the angels who with God are citizens of the higher world; the way in which they both connect the

1. Harnack, DG, I, 47.

2. Goodenough, PFJ, 85-87.

heavenly city with the Garden of Eden, or Paradise; and the way both consider men to be of three main types.

Augustine was a pupil of and convert of Ambrose, the great Latin^e Father. Ambrose of all the Latin Fathers was most filled with Philo's ideas, and has been called Philo latinus. Goodenough agrees with Leisegang who did most of the work of tracing the parallels between Philo and Augustine. He says that it was Ambrose's Philonic allegories of the Old Testament which first broke through Augustine's Manichaeism. Many of the fundamental ideas of Augustine and Philo are found together in Ambrose. It would seem then, from this that Philo played a definite part in the development of Augustinian theology.

The main purpose of this section is to consider the influence of Philo upon Origen, the greatest of the Fathers before Augustine, and one of the greatest of all time.

Origen (185-254)¹ was the creator of the dogmatic of the Church and the one who laid the foundations for a scientific criticism of both the Old and New Testaments. In his work he owed much to Justin, Clement, Tatian, and others who went before him, but the great systematic study was done by Origen.

By proclaiming the reconciliation of the science with the Christian faith, of the highest culture with the Gospel, Origen did more than any other man to win the Old World to the Christian religion.²

1. Harnack, Art.(1910), 270.

2. Loc cit.

He, in many ways, is similar to Philo and sought the solution to the same problems. He wanted to bring all the heterogenous elements of the universe together and so form one unified whole. He also wanted to resolve the antinomies of Scripture if at all possible, as well as to relate God to his universe.

His education was broad and thorough. He attended the lectures of Ammonius Saccas so was well acquainted with Neoplatonism. He also studied the works of Plato, Numenius, the Stoics, Pythagoreans, and other Greek thinkers. Again Harnack says:

As a philosophical idealist, however, he transmutes the whole contents of the faith of the Church into ideas which bear the mark of Neoplatonism, and were accordingly recognized by the later Neoplatonists and Hellenists.¹

For Origen Scripture has three general senses, the literal, the moral, and the spiritual, in which it may be used. So passages lend themselves to one of these, some to two, and some to all three. The Decalogue has moral significance for example. The grain of mustard may be the actual seed, then faith, then the Kingdom of Heaven. The "little foxes" of the Songs of Solomon are typical in the second sense of sin affecting the individual, in the third of heresies attacking the Church. The moral embraces all that touches the single soul in this life, in its

1. Harnack, Art.(1910), 271.

relation to the law of right, or to God; the spiritual includes all "mysteries", all the moments in the history of the community, the Church, and still more in eternity. The main purpose of allegorism is to set forth and interpret the "mysteries" and antinomies of Scripture. For Origen the letter of the text was the rough covering which hid the glorious truth hidden within.

For Origen also there were two heavens and two earths. The visible is but the copy of the invisible. All that God made is good for man's use but it also bears the mark of heavenly things through which the soul may be taught and elevated to a contemplation of the invisible and eternal. The world is but a means of climbing upward to spiritual intelligence.¹

Allegorism had two distinct purposes as found in Origen and others. It is negative or apologetic on one side, while on the other it is positive and didactic. On the apologetic side it is used to interpret passages which do not seem to be reconcilable with the main teaching of Scripture from the literal point of view. Origen knew well that the Greek philosopher who was beginning to study Scripture might well be repelled by the violence of many of the Old Testament Scriptures especially. "Origen felt the embarrassment most acutely, and his fearless logic saw but one way of escape."²

1. Bigg, CPA, 135.

2. Ibid., 138.

On the didactic side allegorism may be sometimes very dangerous and untrue to Scripture. By its use one can put any desired interpretation upon a passage of Scripture. We have seen to what extent Philo carried this practice. By its use also passages which have no Messianic implication whatsoever, may be made to predict his advent. There is no end to the false teaching possible by the excessive use of the allegorical method of interpretation.

It is evident then, that Origen was greatly influenced by the method of Philo. Even as Philo saw the allegory as the means of reconciling the Jewish revelation with Greek philosophy, so also Origen saw it as the means of reconciling both the antinomies of Scripture and of offering a means of interpreting Scripture which would make it acceptable to the outside world. Later much of what he said was to be condemned by the Ecumenical Councils and the Church Fathers.

3. Neoplatonism

The Neoplatonic school began at Alexandria under the leadership of Ammonius Saccas who had been a Christian for a while but later returned to Hellenism. He left no writings so the philosophy of the school was mainly developed by his pupils and successors. Concerning the place of the school in history Heinze says:

Neoplatonism is the last development of Greek philosophy, in which the mind of antiquity, using many of the elements of the older systems, especially the Platonic, passed beyond the

realistic tendencies of the Stoics and Epicureans dogmatically conquered scepticism, and rose to a height of mystic speculation which was influenced partially by oriental and Christian ideas.¹

The great writer of the school was Plotinus a pupil of Ammonius Saccas for over ten years. He also visited Persia where he studied the oriental religions and by which he was definitely influenced. His writings were published by his pupil Porphyry in the six Enneades. At this time the great fields of Greek philosophy were also turning to a study of religion and ethics, as seen in the Stoics and Epicureans. The Academy at Athens was captured by the school of Plotinus and it remained Neoplatonic for the rest of its history, until it was closed by the Emperor Justinian in 529 A. D.

The central doctrine of Neoplatonism was that of the One. There is something in which there is absolute unity. It is transcendental over all yet it is itself the source of all being, the first Cause, the source of all that is good and beautiful, as well as of all activity. Plotinus had a system of emanations much like others prevalent in his day. From the One first issued Nous which also receives from the One the power to produce other existences. It is more than thought, for it is actual being. A third principle, the soul proceeds from Nous. The soul becomes the link between the intelligible world and the phenomenal world, carrying the emanations to the lowest forms.

1. Heinze, Art.(1909), 111.

The content of the soul descends in a certain sense to the lowest stages of matter. This content is made up of Ideas for which the Soul is the archetype.

We might also speak of the Ideas as Logoi. It is they which give form to matter under the guiding principle of rational powers for the Soul which permeates all is itself rational. Through the Logoi, traces of the higher One may be found in matter.

Individual souls proceed from the world soul but they are not a part of it. Individuality in itself means the death of the individual concerned. Salvation is attained when the individual becomes completely united to the One.

There is a definite similarity between the Neoplatonic doctrine of emanations and the Philonic Logoi or powers. It is hard to point out a definite passage and say that Plotinus drew it from Philo but it seems evident that much of his system was suggested by Philo's work. Either that or they both drew upon some third source which is unknown to us but which was prevalent in the time in which they lived.

Neoplatonism failed because of two main reasons. It indulged in excessive speculation which reduced its usefulness, and the rise of the stronger power of Christianity forced it to retrench. Its influence was felt later in a very definite way through the mystics of the Middle Ages.

4. Gnosticism

The most persistent and deep-rooted heresy which the Apostolic Church had to deal with was that of Gnosticism. The name is derived from the Greek word "Gnosis" meaning knowledge. The Gnostics then were those who possessed knowledge. The term is deceptive for the knowledge actually required consisted of a secret revelation which they claimed was transmitted by Christ to a few disciples and through them to others. Jesus said "Unto you is given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven."¹ Those who "knew" were the Gnostics. Bousset says:

These little Gnostic sects and groups all lived in the conviction that they possessed a secret and mysterious knowledge, in no way accessible to the outside, which was not to be proved nor propogated, but believed by the initiated, and anxiously guarded as a secret.²

There were various sects of Gnostics such as, Judaizing Gnostics, Anti-Judaistic Gnostics, Gnostizing Pagans, Orphites, and Manicheans. Their writings were numerous and varied, consisting of Apocalypses, Acts, Psalms, Homilies, dogmatic and philosophical treatises, and commentaries. Much of our information concerning their teachings comes from a study of the polemics of the Church Fathers against them. Many of the creeds which express the minimum requirements for an Orthodox Christian were formulated as a result of this heresy.

On the whole Gnosticism was more or less the stand of the old religions of antiquity against the rising

universal religion of Christianity. It tried by taking something from Christianity and combining it with what there was to maintain itself in the face of this new rising power. But the old form was dead and it was an impossible task. The new wine was bound to burst the old wine-skins!

The philosophy of Gnosticism was dualistic. They separated the transcendent God of the New Testament from the Jehovah who created the world. He was the Demiurge who was completely distinct from the God of love of the New Testament. The Gnostics also separated the supernatural Christ from the historical Jesus. Some groups said that Christ entered into the human body at the Baptism and left it at the Cross. Others maintained that the whole existence of the earthly Christ was an illusion. This dualism was also carried to man as well. There is the spiritual portion which lives within the material body, and this alone is to be redeemed. The result of this teaching was the abuse of the physical body by all forms of excesses in order to free the soul. It meant too, the rejection of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection and redemption of the human body. It is little wonder that the Church violently opposed this heresy. Also with Christianity, salvation is open to all but with Gnosticism it was limited to the few initiated who possessed the secret "Gnosis" which had been transmitted to them alone.

The doctrine of emanations which was present in

Neoplatonism was carried by the Gnostics to a systematic if not logical conclusion.

Irenaeus says that they claimed possession of an esoteric knowledge or Gnosis, revealed only to the initiated; and between the Supreme Being and the world they interposed a number of spiritual powers or aeons, attributing the creation of the visible universe to a subordinate agent, the Demiurge.¹

The Gnostic doctrine of emanations comes much nearer to the Philonic doctrine of powers than the Neoplatonic. Philo had revolted against the anthropomorphic God, and, as a result, raised him above all knowable reality. The great difficulty then was to find some way of relating God to the material universe. Philo solved this by making the divine Reason the connecting link and instrument of creation. The fallacy of making two distinct things out of one thing was evident to the Gnostics. Even the hypos-tatization of God's attributes did not solve the problem, although it seems to have satisfied Philo. The way for all this had in a way been prepared by the Personification of Wisdom, so Philo more or less personified all the attributes. The result was that it had a God who was completely inactive, yet at the same time is the cause of all things.

The Gnostics carried this movement on but they maintained a more spiritual view of the universe. They introduced a whole system of aeons or powers, having the highest emanate from God, the next emanating from the highest, and

1. Watson, PBR, 251.

so on down to material substance. By having enough of these emanations, they felt that God was kept sufficiently transcendent, yet was in some way connected with his universe. In this way they sought to explain the Absoluteness of God and at the same time the imperfections of the universe. Bigg says:

For us they have mainly this interest, that they complete the work of the Philonic analysis. God is finally separated from his attributes, the aeons of Reason and Truth, and becomes the Eternal silence of Valentinus, the non-existent God of Basilides."¹

A word of explanation concerning Valentinus and Basilides, leaders of two of the more prominent sects of Gnosticism, may be deemed necessary. The idea of God's transcendence was carried by the former to the point where God could not be defined, "not because he is absolutely simple, but because of the transcendent fulness of his being."² Basilides carried this to the place where God becomes the deification of the word "not." We are reduced to the point of utter speechlessness! God is "not" anything we can express or even conceive!

It is evident than that Philo's system was used to a definite extent by both the Neoplatonists and Gnostics. The Powers of Philo, and the emanations of Plotinus and the Gnostics all have a common element. Yet none of these systems had any marked effect upon future philosophical and theological developments.

1. Bigg, CPA, 28.

2. Grieve, Art.(1910), 221.

5. Allegorical Method

We have already noted the influence of Philo's method upon Origen, and to a lesser extent upon Ambrose. Others have also adopted this method of Scriptural interpretation, notable Swedenborg and Mary Baker Eddy. A word concerning each of these religious leaders will also be of interest.

Emanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772) the great Swedish scientist, philosopher, and mystic was born at Stockholm in January 1688.¹ His early years were devoted to science, many of his ideas becoming scientific realities many years after his time. From 1734 on he was interested in religion and became more mystical as his development progressed. In the Apocalypse Explained he says that the reason why the Apocalypse is little read or understood is because those who have attempted to explain it "know nothing of the internal or spiritual sense of the word." The word in the letter is natural but in its inward contents it is spiritual; and being such, it contains a sense within it which does not at all appear in the letter."² Swedenborg in this work proceeds to give the true explanation of the Apocalypse, giving it an allegorical meaning. To illustrate how he parallels the work of Philo the following example is given:

(Referring to Matthew 26:24) By this is signified that in the last of the Church there would be no faith in the Lord, because no charity, for cock-crowing as well as twilight signifies the last time of the Church.³

-
1. James, SS, 3.
 2. Swedenborg, AP, 12.
 3. Ibid., 17.

It will be seen from this, that Swedenborg gives a spiritual interpretation to the words of Jesus to Peter concerning the event which was to precede Peter's denial. He, like Philo, allegorizes the most obviously literal passages. It is not necessary for our purpose to go further into the writings of Swedenborg. It is sufficient to point out his use of this method of interpretation.

A similar interpretation is given to Scripture by Mary Baker Eddy (1821-1910) who founded Christian Science. In 1875 she published a book entitled Science and Health, with Key to the Scriptures, which is used by Christian Scientists to interpret the Bible. In this book Mrs. Eddy outlines her interpretation of Scripture. Her basic doctrine is that all is Mind and matter is a delusion. Since matter does not exist, then pain, pleasure, sickness, sin and death are likewise delusions. She reaches her conclusions by giving to Scripture an allegorical meaning. The systems of Swedenborg and Mary Baker Eddy well illustrate the extreme meanings which may be taken from Scripture by the use of this method. Of these two, Christian Science has grown the most and today its churches and healing centres are pretty well scattered over the world.



CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

1. Summary

The city of Alexandria which was founded by Alexander the Great and situated as it was at the mouth of the Nile, became the natural gateway to Egypt and the East. For centuries it thrived commercially and economically, rivaling Rome the centre of the world. Educationally it became for a time the leading city of the world, its great library being of special fame. The city is also famous for the school of philosophy which began there about 30 B. C. and continued almost to the time of the destruction of the city by the Arabs in 642 A. D. The doctrines of the school were a curious blending of Eastern and Western thought, mainly the blending of the Jewish revelation with Greek philosophy. The great figure of the school was Philo Judaeus, the Alexandrian Jew who tried to interpret the Jewish revelation in the light of the Greek metaphysical theories.

The Jewish population of Alexandria numbered about a million persons at the beginning of the Christian Era. Philo tells us something of the anti-Semitic outbursts there which finally resulted in sending an embassy to Rome to seek redress from the Emperor Caius. Philo himself went to Rome at the head of that delegation.

Wherever the Jew went he retained much of his national characteristics, particularly his nationalistic religion.

Although he changed his tongue to Greek or some other language, he never forgot that he was the "chosen seed" and that Jehovah had for him a special purpose. The religious zeal of the Jew has been perhaps the major cause of anti-Semitic demonstrations.

The first attempt to reconcile the Hebrew conception of God with that of the philosophers may be found in the Septuagint. In translating the sacred Scriptures into Greek the writers often departed from the literal Masoretic text in an effort to remove the anthropomorphic conception of God. In Isaiah 6:1 for example "his glory" is substituted for "his robe", in Joshua 4:24 the "power of God" is substituted for the "hand of God;" there are many such instances to be found. These examples do not prove, however, that Philo's doctrine of the cosmical Logos has already been conceived.

Philo is famous for his use of the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture. Yet at the same time he proclaims his absolute orthodoxy and adherence to the truth of Scripture. At the same time by doing violence to the literal meaning of the text, he draws the most amazing and sometimes fantastic conclusions. We might take as typical of this his interpretation of Adam, Eve, and the serpent. Adam is but a figure for "mind", Eve for "sense", and the serpent is "passion." By this he illustrates how passion tempts the senses which in turn lead the mind astray eventually causing destruction.

His writings are numerous, in all there are some forty or fifty lengthy treatises upon Scripture. Nowhere does he make any attempt to set up a systematic presentation of his ideas so they must be gathered by a study of his entire writings. The best edition of his works is found in the Loeb Classical Library in which nine volumes are devoted to him. His main ideas are repeated many times in the same general form.

His great hero was of course Moses whom he believed to have been inspired of God. The word of Moses is the sacred word of Jehovah himself. "Moses, both because he had attained the very summit of philosophy, and because he had been divinely instructed in the greater and most essential part of Nature's lore." (Philo, Op., I, 9)

He was influenced then first by the Hebrew Scriptures, He could never get away from their great monotheistic teaching of Jehovah as the One True God. Scripture describes Jehovah as omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, holy, merciful, good, and just. To all of these Philo gives his complete assent. Yet, when he came in contact with Greek philosophy he became aware of certain possible inconsistencies in their revelation, as well as many things which were only vaguely hinted at or explained.

Secondly, he was influenced by the Judo-Alexandrian Literature. This includes the Sibylline Oracles, The Book of Wisdom, The Letter of Aristéas, and The Fragments of Aristobulus. The personification of "wisdom" had perhaps

the major influence here.

Thirdly, he was influenced by the Greek philosophers. Heraclitus suggested the doctrine of a cosmical Logos. Empedocles suggested the four elements of earth, air, fire, and water, of which the universe was composed. From Plato he borrowed the Theory of Ideas and his division of the soul into three parts of mind, sense, and passion. From Aristotle he takes the idea of the four causes.

Philo conceives of God as purely transcendent. God exists and that is all we can say about him. Through the soul which God has given to man we know of this existence. We cannot know God through our senses in any way. Yet, while he says that God exists and that this existence is all we can know, he goes on to assign to him all the attributes of Scripture. These we have already mentioned. He speaks of God as "Active Cause" and the cosmos as "passive object". This of course he also borrows from Plato, being his demiurge and receptacle. God is transcendent above his creation yet at the same time he is immanent, for he fills the universe with his presence. He concludes that God is All in All, that he needs absolutely nothing from men, that he is King of kings and God of gods.

The cosmos is "passive object." To explain the creation he adopts Plato's theory. First, God created the intelligible world and using it as the archetype, he formed the visible world out of the four unchangeing elements of Heraclitus. In explaining the actual event, Philo adopts

the four Causes of Aristotle. God is the cause of the world, the "by which" it has been produced; the matter is the four elements "from which" it is formed; the instrument is the Logos "through which" it was formed; the reason "for which" it exists is the goodness of the Creator. (Cher., II, 83)

God remains in control of the universe at all times. He never leaves the rule to others, but personally supervises the control, through the Logos or divine Reason. In relation to the universe, God stands in the same position as the mind of man stands in relation to the physical body. God is the governing mind of the universe. Philo makes a striking parallelism between the microcosm and the macrocosm.

Philo was influenced by Plato's three-fold soul, reason, spirit and appetite, for he likewise has three divisions, mind, sense and passion. The mind is seated in the brain, sense is seated in the breast, and passion in the lower organs. The soul is not necessarily immortal but may achieve immortality. Pleasure is the archenemy of the soul. Should reason ever become led astray and fall under the control of passion, the soul is in serious danger of being lost. The way of salvation is to make the passions completely subject to reason and so bring the soul into complete harmony with God. The soul itself is fashioned after the divine Mind and through it alone has one access to God. Only an a priori knowledge of God is then possible, and then only such as God cares to impart

to the soul. Through the senses only phenomena can be perceived, never the Dinge an sich.

Philo's central doctrine is the cosmical Logos. The term "Logos" had been used before his time, mainly for the purpose of removing anthropomorphisms from Scripture. In Greek philosophy it appears as used by Heraclitus as the eternal unchanging principle of the universe which causes all change. Philo introduces the Logos as the intermediatery which stands between God and the universe. It is the link by which the transcendent God is brought into relationship with the cosmos.

For Philo the Logos had a dual aspect. It is both the divine Reason and at the same time the instrument of the divine Will. The Logos is the subjective Mind of God planted out and made objective in the universe. Actually he is talking about two different things as if they were one and the same. The former is the divine Reason the latter is the divine Instrument of all his action.

Philo uses many different figures and epithets to characterize the Logos, depending upon the particular circumstances. It is (1) the Word, (2) the instrument of creation, (3) the eternally begotten son, (4) the eldest or first-born son of God, (5) the man of God. It is also personified as (6) the manna from heaven, (7) the sword that turned in every direction, (8) the cloud by the Red Sea, (9) and the rock in the wilderness. No matter in what relation Jehovah stands to the universe or man,

the Logos is present in some way standing between the two. The very system of his thought forced him to interpose the Logos between the incomprehensible and self-contained God and the creation, hence the Logos becomes the archetype and instrument of all the creation. Man as a rational being is the image of the Logos who is the image of God.

Although Philo personifies the Logos and often uses angels to typify it, it cannot be said that he ever makes the Logos a person. It is from first to last the divine Reason which is made the instrument of creation and the intermediatery between the transcendent God and the physical universe.

In addition to the Logos he had a system of lesser powers. Each of God's acts is made into a power by the process of hypostatization. We have his Goodness, his Sovereignty, his Creative and Regal powers, etc. Each of these performs its own special office, subject always to the control of the Logos or divine Reason. God rules the world through his powers but always subject to reationality. Such is the conception of Philo.

Matter, for Philo, is made up of four unchanging elements, earth, air, fire, and water. These God has taken and formed out of them the visible universe. The universe itself is eternal for it has been created by God who will not destroy his own creation, and there is no other being who could destroy it. He rejects all materialistic

ideas or anything which would tend to lessen the place of God in the universe.

The Creation of man is quite unique. In the Genesis account we read that God said "Let us make man in our image." For Philo this means that God had helpers in creation. The helpers he makes responsible for evil and all imperfections which may be found in man. He thus tries to remove from God the responsibility of creating anything imperfect.. He also Platonizes the creation of man for he says that first God created the man in the heavens after his own image who in turn becomes the pattern for the physical man formed out of the dust of the earth.

The problem of evil he thus solves by making that the work of God's helpers. "It is unreasonable to say that God is the author of everything that concerns the life of man." (Post., III, 433)

Philo also believed in the doctrine of divine election. He held that the patriarchs were especially elected by God to perform certain duties and works. No attempt is made to explain this other than to say that it is God's prerogative. He likewise believes that nations are predestined to play a certain part in history. They may think that they are ruling their own destiny, but Philo says that this is a delusion. They are doing what God has planned for them and allowed them to do. God is at all times in control of his creation.

The allegorical method of Philo has been used by subsequent writers to a considerable extent. Origen was one of the first to make use of it after Philo. Some of the other Church Fathers adopted it to a lesser degree, notably the Latin Father, Ambrose. In modern times it has been used by Emanuel Swedenborg, the Founder of the Church of the New Jerusalem, and by Mary Baker Eddy, the "mother" of Christian Science. By such a method of interpretation, there is no limit to the way of interpreting Scripture, not to the number of systems which may be set up. It is extremely dangerous to use this method to interpret doctrine and establish dogma as it can lead to very fantastic conclusions and systems.

2. Conclusions

For the sake of clarity and conciseness, it is best to state the conclusions in the form of theses.

1. The great bulk of the work of the Alexandrian school of philosophy was done by Philo Judaeus who attempted to reconcile the Jewish revelation with Greek philosophy.

2. He was influenced to some extent by the Judaeo-Alexandrian Literature, mainly perhaps by the personification of wisdom, and by the attempts to remove the anthropomorphisms from the Masoretic text in the Septuagint version of Scripture.

3. He was greatly influenced by the Greek philosophers, mainly Heraclitus, Empedocles, Plato, and Aristotle.

4. Central in his thought is the doctrine of the cosmical Logos, the subjective Reason of God, made objective in the universe.

5. His system of divine powers is simply the hypos-tatization of the attributes of God.

6. His view of God and the universe is very similar to that of the Hebrew Scriptures with some detail added from Greek philosophy, while in his view of the soul, he is influenced by Plato's three-fold division of the soul, in developing his own divisions of mind, sense, and passion.

7. The Neoplatonists and the Gnostics were influenced by his doctrine of powers in their development of a system of emanations to explain the relationship between the transcendent God and the universe.

8. The allegorical method of Philo influenced, to some extent, several of the New Testament writers, notably, John, Paul and the author of Hebrews; also, the term "Logos" appears in John's Prologue as descriptive of Christ, though not with the same meaning and significance, as it has in the writings of Philo.

9. His allegorical method of interpretation influenced Origen, Ambrose, Swedenborg, and Mary Baker Eddy, in their interpretation of Scripture.

10. The influence of Philo today, is slight if any. His allegories are scarcely ever read. His system is too naive to be of any real philosophical or theological import.

APPENDIX

The following is a list of the main writings of Philo with their standard abbreviations. The Roman Numerals refer to the volume in which the work is found in the Loeb Classical Library.

Abr.	VI	On the Life of Abraham. (De Abrahamo).
Aet.	IX	On the Eternity of the World. (De Aeternitate Mundi).
Agr.	III	On the Husbandry of Noah. (De Agricultura).
Ca.	IX	On the Embassy to Caius. (Legation ad Caium).
Cher.	II	On the Cherubim. (De Cherubim).
Conf.	IV	On the Confusion of Tongues. (De Confusione Linguarum).
Cong.	IV	On Mating with the Preliminary Studies. (De Congressu Quaerendae Eruditionis).
Cont.	IX	On the Contemplative Life. (De Vita Contemplativa).
Decal.	VII	On the Decalogue. (De Decalogo).
Det.	II	That the Worse is wont to Attack the Better. (Quod Deterius Poliori Insidiari).
<u>Deus</u>	III	On the Unchangeableness of God. (Quod Deus Immutabilis sit).
Ebr.	III	On Drunkenness. (De Ebrietate).
Fl.	IX	On Flaccus. (In Flaccum).
Fug.	V	On Flight and Finding. (De Fuga et Inventione).
Gig.	II	On the Giants. (De Gigantibus).
Her.	IV	Who is the Heir of Divine Things? (Quis Rerum Divinarum).

- Jos. II On the Life of Joseph.
(De Iesopho).
- L.A. I Allegorical Interpretation, i, ii, iii.
(Legum Allegoriarum).
- Mig. IV On the Migration of Abraham.
(De Migratione Abrahami).
- Mos. VI On the Life of Moses, i, ii.
(De Vita Mosis).
- Mut. VV On the Changing of Names.
(De Mutatione Nominum).
- Op. I On the Creation of the World.
(De Opificio Mundi).
- Plant. III Concerning Noah's Work as a Planter.
(De Plantatione).
- Post. II On the Posterity of Cain and his Exile.
(De Posteritate Caini).
- Praem. VIII On Rewards and Punishments.
(De Praemiis et Poenis).
- Pro. IX On Providence.
(De Providentia).
- Prob. IX Every good Man is Free.
(Quod Omnis Probus Liber sit).
- Sac. II On the Sacrifices offered by Cain and Abel.
(De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini).
- Sob. III The Prayer and Curses of Noah when sober.
(De Sobrietate).
- Som. V On Dreams that they are God-sent.
(Quod a Deo Mittantur Somnia).
- Spec. VII On the Special Laws, i, ii, iii.
VIII On the Special Laws, iv.
(De Specialibus Legibus).
- Virt. VIII On the Virtues.
(De Virtutibus).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aikinson, Charles F.--Art.(1910)
 "Alexandria," in Enc. Brit., I, 568-572.
- Allman, George J.--Art.(1910)
 "Pythagoras," in Enc. Brit., XXII. 698-703.
- Anonymous.--Art.(1910)
 "Alexandrian School," in Enc. Brit., I. 573-575.
- Anonymous.--Art.(1910)
 "Christian Science," in Enc. Brit., VI, 291.
- Arnim, Hans von.--QPA
Quellenstudien zu Philo von Alexandria.
 Berlin: Weidmann, 1888.
- Bartlet, James V.--Art.(1910)
 "Epistle to the Hebrews," in Enc. Brit., XIII, 188-191.
- Bates, Ernest S., and John V. Dittmore.--MBE
Mary Baker Eddy.
 New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1932.
- Bentwich, Norman de Mattos.--PJA
Philo Judaeus of Alexandria.
 Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of
 America, 1910.
- Bigg, Charles.--CPA
The Christian Platonists of Alexandria.
 Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886.
- Bousset, Wilhelm.--Art.(1910).
 "Gnosticism," in Enc. Brit., XII, 152-159.
- Bousset, Wilhelm.--HPG
Hauptprobleme der Gnosis.
 Göttingen, 1907.
- Box, G. H.--Art.(1932-33)
 "The Idea of Intermediation in Jewish Theology," in
The Jewish Quarterly Review, N.S., XXIII, 103-119.
 Philadelphia: The Dropsie College for Hebrew.
- Brehier, Emile.--IPA
Les idees philosophiques et religieuses de Philon
 d'Alexandrie.
 Paris: Picard, 1908.
- Campbell, Lewis.--Art.(1910)
 "Plato," in Enc. Brit., XXI, 808-825.

- Case, Thomas:--Art.(1910)
 "Aristotle," in Enc. Brit., II, 501-522.
- Conybeare, F. C.--PCL
Philo: About the contemplative Life.
 Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895.
- Dods, Marcus.--Art.(n.d.)
 "The Gospel of St. John," in EGT, I, 655-872.
- Drummond, James.--PJ
Philo Judaeus, 2 Vols.
 London: Williams and Norgate, 1888.
- Fairweather, William.--JG
Jesus and the Greeks
 Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1924.
- Fuller, B. A. G.--HAMP
A History of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy.
 New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1938.
- Goodenough, Erwin R.--Art.(1932)
 "A Neo-Pythagorean source in Philo Judaeus," in
Yale Classical Studies, III, 115-164.
- Goodenough, Erwin R.--PPJ
The Politics of Philo Judaeus.
 New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.
- Goodhart, Harold L., and Erwin R. Goodenough.--Art.(1938)
 "General Bibliography of Philo," in Goodenough,
 PPJ, 127-348.
- Grieve, Alexander.--Art.(1910)
 "Swedenborg," in Enc. Brit., XXVI, 221-223.
- Guthrie, Kenneth S. L.--MPA
The Message of Philo Judaeus of Alexandria.
 London: Luzac and Co., 1909.
- Harnack, Adolf, and John Mitchell.--Art.(1910)
 "Neoplatonism," in Enc. Brit., XIX, 372-378.
- Harnack, Adolf.--DG
Dogmengeschichte.
 Freiburg: B. Mohr, 1893.
- Hastings, James, ed.--ERE
Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, 13 Vols.
 New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908.

- Heinze, M.--Art.(1908)
 "Neoplatonism," in SHE, VIII, 111-114.
- Herbermann, Charles G., ed.--Cath. Enc.
The Catholic Encyclopedia, 16 Vols.
 New York: The Universal Knowledge Foundation Inc.,
 1910.
- Hicks, Robert D.--Art.(1910)
 "Stoics," in Enc. Brit., XXV, 942-951.
- Inge, W. R.--Art.(1908)
 "Alexandrian Theology," in Hastings, ERE, I, 308-319.
- James, Henry.--SS
The Secret of Swedenborg.
 Boston: Fields, Osgood, and Co., 1869.
- Kohler, K.--JT
Jewish Theology.
 New York: The Macmillan Co., 1923.
- Krüger, G.--Art.(1908)
 "Gnosticism," in SHE, VI, 496-500.
- Lauterbach, Jacop Z.--Art.(1907)
 "Philo," in Jew. Enc., X, 6-18.
- Lebreton, J.--Art.(1910)
 "Logos," in Cath. Enc., IX, 329-331.
- Madeley, Edward, and B. F. Barrett.--SC
Science of Correspondence.
 Philadelphia: E. Claston and Co., 1884.
- Mitchell, John.--Art.(1910)
 "Heraclitus," in Enc. Brit., XIII, 309-310.
- Nicoll, W. Robertson, ed.--EGT
The Expositors Greek Testament, 5 Vols.
 Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., n.d.
- Philo.--PHI
 (Tr. F. H. Colson, and G. H. Whitaker, in the Loeb
 Classical Library), 9 Vols.
 London: Heinemann, 1929-41 (Now published in the
 United States by Harvard University Press, Cambridge).
- Philo Judaeus.--PJ
 (Tr. C. D. Yonge, Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library)
 London: H. G. Bohn, 1854-55.
- Reville, Jean.--LPA
Le Logos d'apres Philon d'Alexandrie.
 Geneve: Ramboz and Schuchart, 1877

Salmon, Stewart D., and Alexander Grieve.--Art.(1910)
"Logos," in Enc. Brit., XVI, 919-921.

Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.--SHE
 12 Vols., (Samuel Jackson, ed.)
 New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1908-09.

Schürer, Emil, and Charles Bigg.--Art.(1910)
"Philo," in Enc. Brit., XXI, 409-413.

Searle, George M.--TCS
The Truth about Christian Science.
 New York: The Paulist Press, 1916.

Singer, Isodore, ed.--Jew. Enc.
The Jewish Encyclopedia, 12 Vols.
 Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1907.

Snowden, James H.--TCS
The Truth about Christian Science.
 Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1920.

Soulier, Henry.--DLP
La doctrine du Logos chez Philon d'Alexandrie.
 Rome: Loescher, 1876.

Strong, Augustus H.--St
Systematic Theology, 3 Vols. in one.
 Philadelphia: The Judson Press, (1907) 1942.

Swedenborg, Emanuel.--AE
Apocalypse Explained.
 New York: John Allen, 1846.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica.--Enc. Brit.
 New York: The Encyclopaedia Britannica Co., 1910.
 29 Vols.

The Holy Bible.
 American Revised Version.
 New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1901.

The Holy Bible.
 King James Version (1611).
 Philadelphia: National Bible Press, n.d.

Thilly, Frank.--AHP
A History of Philosophy.
 New York: Henry Holt and Co., n.d.

Wallace, William.--Art.(1910)
"Epicurus," in Enc. Brit., IX, 683-686.

Wallace, William.--Art.(1910)

"Empedocles," in Enc. Brit., IX, 344-345

Watson, John.--PBR

The Philosophical Basis of Religion.

Glasgow: John Maclehose and Sons, 1907.

Zöckler, O.--Art.(1908)

"Philo," in SHE, IX, 38-41.



BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02530 58

1 1719 02570 5817

